1723

A SHORT HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING AN INTERMEDIATE STATE AND THE SEPARATE EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL BETWEEN DEATH AND THE GENERAL RESURRECTION,

DEDUCED FROM THE

Beginning of the PROTESTANT REFORMATION, to the PRESENT TIMES.

WITH

Some Thoughts, in a Prefatory Diſcourſe,

ON THE

Uſe and Importance of Theological Controverſy.

AND

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

An Inquiry into the Sentiments of MARTIN LUTHER,

CONCERNING THE

State of the SOUL, between DEATH and the RESURRECTION.

Much of the SOUL *they talk, but all awry.* MILTON.

By Archdeacon Blackburne Author of y^e Confeſſional.

LONDON:

Printed for T. FIELD, in Pater-Noſter-Row; and Sold by Mr. WALTER, at Charing Croſs, Mr. HENDERSON, at the Royal Exchange, and Meſſrs. TODD, and SOUTHERAN, Booksellers at York, 1765.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A

PREFATORY DISCOURSE,

CONTAINING SOME

Thoughts on the USE and IMPORTANCE of THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY.

IF it were to be determined by a general ballot, what particular claſſes of writers ſhould be condemned to everlaſting ſilence, polemic divines would infallibly be honoured with the firſt majority.

They would, in the firſt place, be proſcribed by the members of their own faculty, among whom the ſedate and orderly ſons of diſcretion, are for ever declaring their averſion to all religious diſputation, as dangerous to eccleſiaſtical foundations, bleſſing their ſtars that the repoſe and emoluments of an eſtabliſhment, have ſet them above the

a temptation

temptation of ſeeking their bread or their fame, out of the beaten track of authorized and orthodox confeſſions *(a)*.

With theſe would agree ſtateſmen and politicians, whoſe plans and enterprizes might be grievouſly embarraſſed by theological diſquiſition, of which hiſtory affords multitudes of examples *(b)*.

Lawyers,

(a) A certain ingenious writer hath indeed inſinuated lately, that ſome pious fathers would probably exert themſelves in this province, "if the drudgery of controverſy "were not *too officiouſly* taken out of their hands". *Moral and political Dialogues*, p. 75. Does this gentleman mean that theſe *officious drudges* ſhould ſtay for the *licence* of their pious fathers, as was the caſe in the reigns of the *Jameſes* and the *Charleſes?* One *pious father* I could name, who when theſe dialogues were publiſhed, was ſtill living, an honour and an ornament to the bench he ſat upon, not only entertained different ſentiments, but did not ſcruple to publiſh them to the world, in one of the ſtrongeſt and moſt affecting pleas for *the liberty of the preſs*, that the preſent or perhaps the laſt age has ſeen. And I would willingly hope he may have left behind him *pious fathers* of the ſame generous way of thinking.

(b) Politici qui ſæpe dogmata vera à falſis, ſalubria a noxiis non norunt diſtinguere, omnia nova ſuſpecta habent. Grot. in *Act.* xvii. 6. "In this maxim [*viz.* that the grand points "of Chriſtianity ought to be taken as infallible revelations] "all bigotted divines and free-thinking politicians agree; "the one for fear of diſturbing the eſtabliſhed religion; the "other leſt the diſturbance ſhould prove injurious to their "adminiſtratian of government." *Note* upon a letter of *Bolingbroke* to *Swift* in *Pope*'s Works, Vol. IX. p. 121. ed. 1753. One would imagine the author of this note would have

Lawyers, Phyſicians, and Philoſophers of different claſſes, might perhaps foreſee little or no inconvenience in debates, with which their ſtudies and occupations are underſtood to have ſo little connexion *(c)*. The ſuffrage of theſe however muſt of courſe be conformable to the taſte of their clients, patients, and patrons.

have no objection to the *examination*, and, if need be, the *correction* of theological forms and ſyſtems. Common fame however, ſpeaks him to be the ſame perſon of whom it is ſaid in *another note*, that, " he is one of thoſe men who wiſh " to ſee things continue as they are, and not, *as the ſaints* " *yearn*, to ſee the rubbiſh of human ordinances taken out " of the way." [*Moral and political* dialogues, p. 295.] Would not ſome people conclude from hence, that he muſt either be a *bigotted divine* or a *free-thinking politician?* But *conſiſtency* is not the vice of theſe *moral* and *political* writers. For, would you believe it? This very man who thus ſneers *the godly work of reformation*, falls foul, in his *Poſtſcript*, upon *Hume* the hiſtorian, for " laying out half of his pains in " expoſing the abſurdities of reformed religion." Now *Hume*'s pains are chiefly laid out in taxing the reformers themſelves with *enthuſiaſm* and *ſedition*. And is not this the very objection which this *Dialogiſt* and his maſter have to thoſe, whom he, in deriſion, calls *ſaints?* And will they undertake to ſhew that the *ſaints* he means go upon *worſe* or *other* principles, than our *firſt* reformers?

(*c*) We are told however that the *catholic* Phyſicians of *France* made the greateſt oppoſition of any others to *Proteſtants* taking degrees in *their* faculty after the Edict of *Nantes*. *Comme ſi la doctrine des Medecins*, ſays the hiſtorian, *avoit de grands interets a demeler avec l'hereſie*. Hiſt. de l'Edit de Nantes, *Liv.* vi. p. 271.

On another hand, the profeſſors in *polite* literature, the connoiſſeurs in the *fine*, and the adepts in the *finer* arts, perfectly ſhudder at the ſight of any thing that has a ſcholaſtic or a theological air. The ſpectres of the indelicate *Luther*, and the horrid *Calvin* are ever before their eyes, and the ſound of the axes and hammers, wherewith their diſciples broke down all the carved work of the mother and miſtreſs of muſic, painting, and ſculpture, ſtill in their ears; and if future debates ſhould bring on a farther degree of what theſe *zealots* called reformation, who can anſwer that a ſingle *Madona* of any character might ſurvive the ſtorm *(d)*?

In one word, this general diſaffection to religious controverſy, is ſo prevalent, that if we believe the monthly writers, who cater for readers of all taſtes and complexions, there is not one ſtomach in a thouſand that can digeſt it. Con-

(d) Crit. Review for *Feb.* 1762. p. 133. And for *June* the ſame year, p. 460. And Mr. Walpole's Anecdotes of painting, Vol. III. p. 1, 2.

troverſial

troverſial Divinity is accordingly repreſented in their collections, as ſtale, inſipid, meagre and nauſeous, and, in general, fit for nothing but to be returned upon the hands of thoſe who bring it to market (*e*).

There have been times however when it bore a better character, and found a more equitable and even honourable reception; for what particular ſervices may be underſtood by the following account of the age of *Thomas Becket* taken from Mr. *David Hume*, a witneſs in the preſent caſe, to whoſe competency there lies no objection.

(*e*) "There is ſcarce any ſpecies of writing ſo unprofit-"able to the public, as polemic divinity." *Monthly Review* for *September* 1764. p. 237. Be it known to the Reader that one of the two controverſies which drew this remark from theſe *ſentimental* critics, was that called the *Bangorian*, in the event of which, the death-ſtroke was given to the principles of civil and eccleſiaſtical tyranny, ſo that they have never ſince been able to hold up their heads, not even in the ſhape of an *alliance*, under which a craftſman of no ordinary ſkill hath more lately endeavoured to revive and reinſtate them. What muſt we think of the men who call theſe queſtions *unprofitable to the public?* But they have already received their correction from an abler hand, in an excellent letter, ſigned, HODLEIANUS in the St. *James's* Chronicle of *October* 27, 1764.

"The

" The ſpirit of ſuperſtition was ſo
" prevalent that it infallibly caught every
" careleſs reaſoner, much more every
" one whoſe intereſt, honour, and am-
" bition were engaged to ſupport it.
" All the wretched literature of the
" times, was inliſted on that ſide. Some
" faint glimmerings of common ſenſe
" might ſometimes pierce through the
" thick cloud of ignorance, or what
" was worſe, the illuſions of perverted
" ſcience, which had blotted out the
" ſun, and envelloped the face of nature.
" But thoſe who preſerved themſelves
" untainted from the general contagion,
" proceeded on no principles which
" they could pretend to juſtifie. They
" were more beholden to their total
" want of inſtruction, than to their
" knowledge, if they ſtill retained
" ſome ſhare of underſtanding. Folly
" was poſſeſſed of all the ſchools, as
" well as all the churches, and her vo-
" taries aſſumed the garb of philoſo-
" phers,

" phers, together with the enſigns of " ſpiritual dignities *(f)*."

To diſperſe theſe clouds of folly and ſuperſtition, was, I apprehend, from the very nature of the caſe, the proper work of theological controverſy, and this work, hiſtory informs us, theological controverſy performed. *Roger Bacon* was one of the firſt who felt the incumbrance of ſuperſtition, and the influence it had in controuling all his endeavours to propagate learning and ſcience in various branches. He was accordingly obliged to fight his way through many eſtabliſhed follies and abſurdities, in order to introduce thoſe amazing plans, which are ſtill doing honour to his name and memory *(g)*. 'Tis true, he ſo far failed, that ſuperſtition ſtill kept its ground, and prevented in a great meaſure, the raiſing any ſuperſtructures of conſequence upon *Bacon*'s foundations, for full two

(f) *Hume*'s Hiſt. Vol. I. p. 294. 4^to^.
(g) See *Bacon*'s [Roger] article in the *Biogr. Britan.* Rem. (*c*)

hundred

hundred years. At length aroſe *Martin Luther*, who, confining all his powers to theological controverſy, laid bare the ſuperſtition of the times to the very root, and expoſed it in all its deformity, to the view of the whole world. From this period true religion and uſeful learning ſprung up together at a thouſand openings, were cheriſhed by the kindly heat of patronage and emulation, and plentifully watered by the free courſe of rational debate, to which the uncontrouled examination of the ſcriptures gave the firſt occaſion *(h)*.

Mr. Hume indeed hath ſaid elſewhere, that " the ſpirit of popiſh ſuperſtition

(*h*) Dr. *Middleton* is no inconſiderable authority to our purpoſe. Speaking of Brutus' and Cicero's correſpondence he tells us, that, " As the genuin letters ſubſiſted till the " purity of the Latin was loſt, ſo theſe remains which are " now in our hands, were actually in being *long before* that " purity revived, being cited by *Petrarch*, *two centuries be-* " *fore the reformation.*" Which he conſequently conſiders as the epoch whence taſte and fine writing began to floriſh in *Europe*. Diſſert. on theſe Epiſt. p. XIV. A book was put into the Index expurgatorius, anno 1677, with an Appendix, *De abominanda barbarie quæ rem literariam ante* LUTHERUM *fædaverat*. See the Roman Index of *Benedict* XIV. publiſhed in the year 1758. p. 182. at the word MITTERNACHT.

" was

" was no hindrance to the introduction " of literature, or even of liberty *(i)*." But reconcile this who can, with what he ſays, p. 286. of the volume already cited, *viz.* " that the prevailing opini- " ons and ſentiments of the age [of " *Becket*] were matter of principle and " conſcience." In that caſe ſurely, they muſt continue to keep the mind in the darkneſs and ſlavery above deſcribed, till they were refuted and exploded; and that they never were to any purpoſe till the time of *Luther*'s reformation. If Mr. *Hume* thinks fit to contradict himſelf, it is nothing to me. There are certain ſeaſons when authors loſe the ſenſation of their own prejudices, and then it is you may follow them with the greateſt ſafety. The paſſage I have cited from Mr. *Hume*, concerns a period of time, when the proteſtant reformation was out of ſight, when Mr. *Hume* perhaps thought not of it; when the force

(i) See the maſterly Letters on Mr. *Hume*'s Hiſtory, printed for *Sands* and *Donaldſon* at *Edinburgh* 1758. Letters IV and V.

of truth extorted from him a repreſentation, which his averſion to our firſt Reformers was not at hand to controul.

A more recent critic, who is otherwiſe diſpoſed to do our firſt Reformers full juſtice, ſeems to me to have blamed them in the wrong place, by not diſtinguiſhing ſufficiently between the effects of eccleſiaſtical tyranny, and the effects of thoſe controverſies to which *that* gave gave occaſion.

" The Calviniſtical principles of the " *Genevan* diſcipline, he tells us, tended " to inſpire a perſecuting ſpirit: pole- " mical writings conduced to inflame " religious diſpoſitions *(k)*."

And is not this equally true of the *epiſcopal* principles of *Engliſh* diſcipline, and of the inflammatory polemic writings in our own country an hundred years after *Calvin* was in his grave? And were there no *improvements* going forward during that whole century? The honeſt truth is, that theſe very contro-

(*i*) See the Critical Review for July 1764. Art. i. p. 8.

verſies

verſies firſt ſtruck out, and, in due time, perfected thoſe noble and generous principles of religious and civil liberty, which, too probably, without theſe ſtruggles, or ſomething of the ſame ſort, would hardly have been well underſtood to this very hour. It is to the controverſies about the *Geneva*-diſcipline, that we owe the efforts of the excellent *Caſtellio* to diſgrace the infernal doctrine of puniſhing heretics capitally. And though it may be ſaid of him, *magnis tamen excidit auſis*, yet did not his documents *ſtarve* with him *, but being bred and gradually nouriſhed by certain choice ſpirits, became ſtrong enough, in the next century, to bring the great patron and practiſer of the vile doctrine in our own country, to the block.

Our Critic goes on. "The conteſts "ran high between the Papiſts and the "Lutherans; and the *rage* of contro-"verſy took place of calm reaſoning, "candid enquiry, and cool diſquiſition."

* *Caſtellio*, after his diſmiſſion from *Geneva*, lived and died at *Baſil* in the utmoſt poverty. See *Bayle*'s Dictionary.

This is writing backwards. But no matter; let us attend him. It would be very obliging if this gentleman would inform us where all this *calm reaſoning*, *candid enquiry*, and *cool diſquiſition* were to be found, *before* the conteſt between the Papiſts and the Lutherans commenced. If they had not *then* exiſted, the rage of controverſy could not *then* take place of them. If *calmneſs* and *candor* were then common things in mens diſquiſitions, in what inſtance, we requeſt to know, were they ſuperſeded by the rage of controverſy? When *Luther* firſt attacked Indulgences, publicly, by poſting up his Theſes, he declared, that *calm reaſoning* and *candid inquiry* into the truth, was all he aimed at. To this *Maimbourg* bears witneſs, as well as *Sleidan* and *Seckendorf* (*l*). And the truth of it is confirmed by the calm and even ſubmiſſive letters he wrote to the

(*l*) Non pas, dit il [i. e. Luther] pour les [Theſes] aſſurer et les ſoûtenir comme veritables, mais ſeulement pour les examiner (dans une diſpute reglee, a fin qu'on pût s'eciaircir de la verite. *Maimb.* Hiſt. Luth. liv. i. p. 31. *Sleidan.* lib. i. p. 1, 2. *Seckendorf.* lib. i. p. 24.

Pope,

Pope, the Archbiſhop of *Mentz*, and the biſhop of *Brandenburgh*. The rage of controverſy, it is owned, began on this occaſion, by the fury of *Eccius* and *Prierias*: and whatever this learned critic may think, if theſe men, and their fellows had not been followed and expoſed in their own way, in all human probability, every advantage which the writer of this eſſay himſelf aſcribes to the proteſtant reformation, had been diſappointed.

" But though, continues our critic, " the virulence of theſe diſputants re- " tarded, for a time, the progreſs of " arts, ſciences, and belles lettres, yet " ſome extraordinary geniuſes adorned " the 15th century, whoſe enlightened " underſtandings ſurmounted all ob- " ſtacles."

In what one inſtance, can it be pretended, that the virulence of theſe diſputants retarded the progreſs of arts, &c. for a ſingle moment? *Luther* himſelf at leaſt is innocent of the charge, who was a connoiſſeur in muſic; not only a performer

former, but a ſkillful compoſer (*m*). And one of his domeſtic concerts, where Luther himſelf preſides is the ſubject of a capital picture by *Titian* now to be ſeen in *Scotland* (*n*). He was alſo an ingenious *deſigner*, of which a remarkable inſtance is preſerved by *Sleidan* (*o*). And, as Dr. *Jortin* expreſſes it, ſacrificed to the Graces in ſome elegant latin verſes (*p*); and all this in the midſt of the *rage* and *virulence* of controverſy, of which he bore the greateſt burden every way. How many thouſand artiſts and philoſophers were there in thoſe days, to whoſe progreſs theſe diſputes did not, could not give the leaſt interruption?

But who, after all, were theſe extraordinary Geniuſes, who, in ſpite of polemic divinity, adorned the 15th century? Will the reader believe that the only inſtance produced is our SHAKESPEARE?

(*m*) *Seckendorf*, lib. i. p. 21.

(*n*) In the collection of the right hon^ble^ the Earl of *Kinnoul* at *Duplin* Caſtle.

(*o*) *Sleidan*. Com. lib. xvi. p. 344. fol.

(*p*) Life of *Eraſmus*, Vol. I. p. 126. and ſee *Seckendorf*, lib. iii. p. 165, where there are ſpecimens.

who

who was not born till half of the 16th century was run out? With the like want of preciſion are *Bacon*, *Raphael*, and *Holbein* referred by this writer to one and the ſame period; and the pleaſantry of it is, that ſuch men as *Shakeſpeare* and *Holbein* ſhould have obſtacles thrown in their way by polemic divinity!

Many others of the ſame caſt with our critic have retailed theſe random cenſures on theological controverſy, againſt whom however we can appeal to writers of the firſt eminence, who have had the candour and the conſcience to acknowledge that ſcience and literature are indebted to it for ſome of their moſt valuable improvements. "But then, ſay "our contemporaries, it was but as "*ſcaffolding*, which the building being "ſo far advanced, may be ſpared, and "the finiſhings executed to better ad-"vantage without it."

All in good time. Are you ſure that ſcience and literature, in their preſent ſtate, may not ſtill be beholden to theological diſquiſition, even in the inferior province

province of *ſcaffolding?* There may be ſome inſignificant ſorts of literature, the farther improvement of which would not quit the coſt: and it would be abſurd to ſay that theology, as a ſcience, hath a neceſſary or immediate connexion with all other branches of learning of more importance. What I plead is this. While debate and examination are allowed and countenanced in matters of religion, which is of the higheſt concern, there will be no danger that the door ſhould be ſhut againſt inquirers into matters of another nature and tendency. But if the popular religion ſhould once be ſettled into an uncontroulable form, conſider the conſequence. Syſtem, whether compoſed of popiſh or proteſtant materials, is ſyſtem ſtill; the child of pride and avarice, and the fondling of tyrants, hypocrites, and bigots. By theſe, ſcience and literature of all kinds have ever been ſuſpected, as unfavourable to orthodox foundations. Who knows what the ſons of genius may ſtrike out in our own, or in future times?

times? Would you put it in the power of thoſe who patronize the ſyſtem in vogue, to check theſe efforts by the narrow bounds they are diſpoſed to preſcribe? Be provident therefore, if you will not be grateful. Encourage examination and rational debate for your own ſakes. Keep open the door for others that it may not be ſhut againſt yourſelves *(r)*.

"But modern controverſy is dull, "trifling, unimportant, and inſipid; and "what is ſtill worſe, carried on with a "rudeneſs and acrimony highly offen-"ſive to politeneſs, and ſometimes to "common decency; and particularly "ſcandalizing in the clerical order, "where the greateſt number of polemic "writers are to be found."

But who are the greateſt ſufferers by dull, trifling, inſipid performances? ſure-

(r) "Learning owes its flouriſhing ſtate to the preſs, "and as any branch of learning may chance to be con-"nected with ſome ſcheme of policy, the reſtraints of a li-"cenſe or *imprimatur*, would cramp and fetter ingenious "minds to ſuch a degree, that they would compoſe them-"ſelves to reſt, and leave learned and curious diſquiſitions, "for ſuch puerilities in literature as cannot offend." *Eſſay on the Liberty of the Preſs*, pag. 40.

ly either the authors, or the retailers of them; but moſt commonly the former. And would you envy ſuch men the privilege of gratifying their vanity, at a ſort of expence which of all others brings them the ſooneſt to repentance? Is there any fear that capable and judicious readers ſhould over-rate ſuch writers? And have not others as much right to indulge their *taſte* as you or I? In the mean time there are writers in the ſame province of real merit. Let all of them have a fair trial, and a candid hearing, and proſcribe the blockheads as ſoon as you will.

The wrath, acrimony, inſolence, and dogmatic ſpirit of ſome controverſial writings are, we own, indefenſible. They are not pardonable in thoſe who have the beſt cauſe in the world, and are in other reſpects, the ableſt defenders of it. Nevertheleſs, theſe are, in ſome inſtances, neceſſary evils; in others they will admit of extenuation. In ſome men, an eager ſpirit is a fault of conſtitution. From others, even good men,

angry

angry or ſatyrical expreſſions may be forced by juſt provocation. " If any " where (ſays one of our Great Grand- " fathers) I have uſed more ſharpneſs " than is pleaſing to men who would " have all polemical writings managed " without paſſion, I ſhall only ſay that " the Drs. (*Heylin*'s) hard grating, hath " ſharpened my ſtyle, and made it more " keen and piercing, than I could have " allowed myſelf to uſe towards a good- " natured adverſary. 'Tis almoſt morally " impoſſible for him who contends with " a fiery and furious antagoniſt, not to " be ſometimes a little overheated." If the hands of every writer were to be tied, who does not keep within the ſtrict bounds of Chriſtian moderation and lenity, I know ſome individuals of other claſſes, who would be as impatient under the reſtraint as any divine of them all. And why ſhould divines be obliged to ſet an example, which writers on other ſubjects are not obliged to follow?

Mr. *Bayle*, in one of his fits of candor, finds fault with Mr. *Claude* for ſaying,

in excuſe of *Luther*'s intemperate ſtyle, that, "Perhaps there was ſome particu-"lar neceſſity, at the time of the refor-"mation, to employ the ſtrongeſt ex-"preſſions to awaken men from that pro-"found ſlumber, in which they had lain "ſo long." Whereupon Mr. *Bayle* obſerves that, "becauſe God is pleaſed "ſometimes to make uſe of ſuch inſtru-"ments, it will not follow that violence "and paſſion are commendable, upon "pretence that the corruption of the "world needs the harſheſt treatment *(s)*." I apprehend Mr. *Claude* did not think of *commending* Luther's *paſſion* and *violence*; on the contrary, he wiſhes he had been more temperate in his writings. So do I, if his intemperance, upon any occaſion, led him into calumny or falſehood; which however in deſcending to particular inſtances, would bear a diſpute *(t)*. For the

(s) Bayle's Dict. *Luther* [T]

(t) For inſtance, where he ſays *Jerom Alexander* was born a *Jew*. Others had ſaid ſo before *Luther*; and though *Alexander*, in refuting this imputation, inſiſted upon being deſcended from the Marquiſſes of *Iſtria*, yet it was ſaid, *that* family

the reſt, if the times wanted *Luther*, they wanted him with all his appurtenances; nor could his zeal, or what is called his *intemperance*, have been ſpared, without wanting the Reformation too *(u)*.

But every intemperate writer is not a *Luther*, nor intituled to the ſame allowances. Let us therefore freely conſign all paſſionate polemics to thoſe officers of juſtice in the republic of Letters,

family knew nothing of him; and Mr. *Bayle* himſelf is obliged to leave the matter in uncertainty. *Dict.* Alexander. (G).

(*u*) *Melchior Adam*, having inſinuated that *Luther* might have made greater proficiency in his youthful ſtudies than he did, if he had met with proper maſters, adds, *Et fortaſſis ad leniendam vehementiam naturæ, mitiora ſtudia veræ philoſophiæ, et cura formandæ orationis profuiſſent.* Vit. *Luth.* p. 102. *Luther* ſtudied the ſcriptures with the utmoſt attention and aſſiduity, and wanted no helps to underſtand them which the age afforded. If this ſtudy could not correct any blameable vehemence in *Luther*'s nature, what *true philoſophy* might that be which would have done the buſineſs more effectually? With reſpect to the event, it was much better as it was. How fit a more temperate and polite ſcholar would have been for the work *Luther* went through, may be conjectured, by conſidering the conduct of *Eraſmus*, who, with all *Luther*'s convictions upon his mind, could never bring himſelf nearer a reformation than ſome ſatyrical ſtrokes upon the ſtupidity and impoſtures of Monkery, ſevere enough indeed in ſome inſtances, but of no great ſignificance from the pen of ſuch a writer, who idolized the Pope and the great churchmen of his time, the patrons and upholders of every religious abuſe and corruption, with the moſt abject adulation.

who,

who, to give them their due, are not ſlack in bringing offenders of this kind to condign puniſhment.

After all, may there not be a little affectation in this general clamour againſt warm and ſatyrical diſputants? Is human nature ſo totally mortified in all thoſe who pretend to be ſcandalized at this way of managing controverſy, that they immediately throw by every book which has any ſprinklings of *Attic ſalt*, or even of *Roman wormwood?* I once knew a very great and good man who was ingenuous enough to acknowledge, *He had greatly profited by ſome books in which he ſhould hardly have read three pages, if they had not been enlivened by a ſort of ſpirit by no means allied to Chriſtian meekneſs.*

But the moſt provoking circumſtance in this caſe is, that numbers of writers complain of this offenſive acrimony in others, who are much leſs faulty than themſelves *(w)*. Theſe ſhould never be looked

(w) " He *(Voltaire)* is always talking of reaſon, humanity, forbearance, and mildneſs: he is always lamenting " the

looked upon in any other light, than as ſeeking apologies for indulging their own licentious genius, at the expence of much better men than themſelves, who never gave them the leaſt pretence for retaliations of this kind: of which ſome very ſtriking examples might be produced.

Perhaps if one were to enquire ſtrictly into the cauſes why certain reſcripts, of no ſmall intrinſic merit, and on no trifling ſubjects, have met with ſo cool a reception in the world, it would be found that the gentle, modeſt and pacific manner, in which the authors of them have delivered their ſentiments, has contributed more than any thing elſe to

" the indecent quarrels and animoſities that prevail too much " among men of learning; and perhaps no man living acts " more in oppoſition to theſe pompous profeſſions. He has " compoſed an agreeable and witty chapter concerning " *printed Lies*; and no author certainly hath printed more " than he himſelf." *Annual Regiſter*. 1762. p. 50. Think not, reader, I have gone to *France* for want of examples at home. They were bold *Britons* who gave occaſion to the Poet to remark

That, Candour's maxims flow from Rancour's throat.

Nor has any man been louder in his complaints of this ſort, than the moſt *abuſive* writer of our own times and country.

their being ſo little regarded *(x)*. And this I take to have been the caſe with that particular queſtion on which the enſuing papers are employed. Dr. *Law*'s Appendix is ſo drawn up, as not to give the leaſt offence, either to thoſe who hold the contrary doctrine upon the credit of the church, or to any particular writer who hath explained his own ſenſe of the matter to the public. Mr. *Peckard*'s firſt and ſecond *Obſervations*, as well as his *Anſwer* to *Fleming*, are patterns of politeneſs and moderation, as well as of ſolid reaſoning and good ſenſe. Yet have they both been treated with the vileſt calumny, attended with the moſt abſurd as well as baſeſt inſinuations. And though their adverſaries are

(x) A pregnant inſtance of this, is the book called *Free and candid Diſquiſitions relating to the Church of England*, &c. to which the greateſt objection with ſome perſons was, the humble and ſubmiſſive terms in which the authors of that work delivered their ſentiments and propoſals, called by ſome people, *cant* and *whining*. Thus it was of old, and thus it is ſtill. There are ſubjects of the utmoſt importance to the credit and advancement of true religion, to which, whether they who handle them *pipe* or *mourn*, the men of *this* generation will pay no attention. *Whereunto ſhall they be likened?*

the

the weakeſt of all weak writers, yet have they, to all outward appearance, carried their point; the generality of popular ſpeakers or writers, who have occaſion to touch upon the future condition of the human ſoul, adhering ſtill to the ſyſtem of a *conſcious intermediate ſtate*, reſting, as they would have it believed, upon the complicated evidence of ſcripture and philoſophy.

I remember a remark ſomewhere, that the generality of readers, when they meet with a writer of controverſy who keeps within the bounds of moderation and civility, and more particularly if he expreſſes the leaſt diffidence with reſpect to any part of his argument, preſently conclude that ſuch a man does not intereſt himſelf greatly for the truth of his cauſe, and that conſequently the matter in debate is of no eſpecial importance.

Whether for this, or for ſome other reaſon, there is room to believe that this is the judgment that is moſt commonly formed of the diſpute concerning the *intermediate ſtate* of man between death and

the reſurrection. It is ſuppoſed to be a matter of indifference to chriſtians who believe a reſurrection of the dead, and a final judgment, in what condition the man, or the ſoul, after the death of the body, remains, during the interval.

In order therefore to ſhew the ſlender foundation there is for a prejudice of this ſort, it will be neceſſary once more to ſtate the caſe, and to examine what pretenſions this queſtion may have to the attention of the ſerious, diſpaſſionate and reaſonable part of mankind?

The queſtion is, whether the ſcriptures afford any juſt and ſolid grounds for the doctrine of the immortality of the ſoul of man, and particularly, any evidence of its exiſtence, when diſunited from the body, in a ſtate of conſcious perception; and whether, in conſequence of this notion, there is not a certain intermediate ſtate of happineſs and miſery for good and wicked men reſpectively, between death and the general reſurrection?

They who hold the negative in theſe points, allege, that according to the ſcriptures,

tures, life and immortality were brought to light by the Goſpel of Chriſt, in a ſenſe excluſive of all other teachers, and all other revelation, at leaſt from the birth of *Moſes* downwards; excluſive likewiſe of all information from the light of nature, or the reſult of philoſophical diſquiſition on the ſubſtance or qualities of the human ſoul. They inſiſt that Chriſt is *the way*, *the truth*, *and the life*, ſo that no man *cometh to the father* [ſo as to be *like him*, and *to ſee him as he is* in a future ſtate] but by the mediatorial power of Chriſt. That the way of *coming to God*, in the ſenſe, and by the means abovementioned, *is the reſurrection of the dead*, of which, *aſſurance is given unto all men*, by the reſurrection of JESUS. They hold moreover, that the ſentence pronounced upon our firſt parents, imported a total deprivation of life, without any reſerve or ſaving to the life of the ſoul; and conſequently, that eternal life, or a reſtoration and redemption from the conſequences of this ſentence, was effected for, revealed, conſigned and inſured to man,

in and through Chriſt, and will be accompliſhed in no other way than that ſpoken of by Chriſt and his apoſtles, who have left no room to conclude that there is a *ſeparate* or *intermediate* life for the ſoul, when diſunited from the body.

On the other ſide it is inſiſted, that the human ſoul is immortal in its own nature, and capable of an active and conſcious exiſtence in a ſtate of diſunion and ſeparation from the body. That this natural capacity of the ſoul was not impaired, or at all affected by any thing that happened upon the tranſgreſſion of our firſt parents; and that the death to which they were condemned, was only the death of the body. The conſequence of all which is, that there is, and would have been a future immortal ſtate of being beyond the preſent life, and (the moral attributes of God pre-ſuppoſed) a juſt retribution therein, independent of the doctrine of a reſurrection of the dead.

Now ſo far as this is the creed of believers in Chriſt, it requires ſome explanation, leſt it ſhould ſeem to make void,

or

or at leaſt render inſignificant or unneceſſary ſome of the capital truths of the Goſpel. Accordingly, divers methods of accommodating this philoſophical theory to the doctrine of the ſcripture, have been invented, that theſe priveleges of *nature* may not appear to tranſcend the riches of *Goſpel-grace*. The principal of which is, placing *redemption*, *ſalvation*, &c. in and through Jeſus Chriſt, in circumſtances which either keep the ideas of Life and Death out of ſight, or reduce them to mere figurative terms; either, for example, in modes of purification from the ſtains of original ſin, or in certain ſecret effects and influences of grace and faith upon the ſoul, or in communications of the holy ſpirit to which man, in his *unregenerate* ſtate, could have no title.

And then again, leſt the end of a reſurrection of the dead ſhould ſeem to be defeated by the hypotheſis of a permanent life and conſciouſneſs in the ſoul, and its capability of happineſs and miſery in a ſeparate ſtate, an *intermediate* condition is contrived, in which the departed

parted ſouls of good men are ſuppoſed to have an *imperfect* reward, and the ſouls of the wicked an *imperfect* puniſhment, during the interval between death and the general reſurrection, when every one will receive a full and complete recompenſe for the deeds done in the body.

It is well known how eaſily theſe things are taken upon truſt, and how little diſpoſed the generality are to examine how far they agree with the ſcriptures: and there is one argument, much inſiſted on, which ſeems to make examination upon this head, unneceſſary. "If a future "ſtate, ſay theſe reaſoners, is but aſcer-"tained, it can be no great matter upon "which of theſe hypotheſes it is found-"ed. Which way ſoever the point is "decided, the ſanctions of the Goſpel "ſtand ſure. They who deny an inter-"mediate ſtate, acknowledge the reſur-"rection of the dead, and a future judg-"ment; and they who hold a ſeparate "exiſtence of the ſoul in an intermediate "ſtate, mean not to preclude or ſuper-"ſede a final retribution, or the reſur-

"rection

" rection of the dead. So that the mo-
" tives to virtue and righteouſneſs, and the
" diſcouragements of vice and iniquity,
" taken from the certainty of a future
" recompenſe, being ſecured either way,
" it is of little or no conſequence which
" of theſe opinions we eſpouſe."

But might not one reaſon thus upon many other controverted points, ſome of which perhaps may be thought to be of much greater importance? It is readily allowed that, where good chriſtians bring forth the fruits of the Goſpel ſpirit in their manners and diſpoſitions, it may not always be neceſſary or expedient to diſquiet them with objections to their peculiar tenets, though manifeſtly wrong and abſurd; eſpecially where there is reaſon to believe, that what you would ſubſtitute in the place of ſuch tenets, would have no better effect upon their moral ſentiments and practices, than their preſent opinions. My charity inclines me to hope and believe there may be ſome bigotted papiſts, who hold all the errors of their church to the very extremes

tremes of idolatry and ſuperſtition, who nevertheleſs exhibit the true chriſtian character in their general practice. And I am likewiſe perſwaded that ſome ſuch there may be among the followers of *Mahomet*.

What then? Becauſe there are here and there inſtances of individuals, who are not *practically* corrupted by the influence of the errors they hold, is there no utility or edification in expoſing the corruptions of Popery, or the fables of Mahometiſm? Pitch upon any church or religious ſociety where you will, and how ſmall a proportion do they who ſtick to the purely preceptive part of their inſtitute, without deviating into the licentiouſneſs for which their reſpective ſyſtems of doctrine and diſcipline leave room, bear to thoſe, who, provided they are orthodox in their profeſſions of faith, and conformable to eccleſiaſtical forms, ſcruple not to follow their own appetites and devices, in ſure and certain confidence of eſcaping at the laſt, by the means of thoſe diſpenſations, atonements, abſo-

lutions, &c. with which all religious ſocieties are, in ſome degree, provided?

If the doctrines and precepts of Chriſt are in truth the ſtandards of piety and virtue, and the rules and directories to the higheſt perfection frail man can arrive at in the preſent life, and to the conſummation of his beſt hopes in another, it muſt be of the utmoſt importance, that theſe doctrines and precepts ſhould be underſtood in the very ſenſe, as near as may be, in which they were delivered by our bleſſed Lord, and thoſe commiſſioned by him to diſpenſe them to the world. To preach and to propagate erroneous interpretations of Goſpel-doctrine, though by accident no evil impreſſions may be made by it upon ſome few well diſpoſed minds, muſt infallibly have a worſe effect upon a large majority. And there are examples in the New Teſtament, ſhewing evidently enough, that this was the opinion of the apoſtles and their aſſiſtants *(y)*.

(y) See Acts xviii. 24, 25, and compare chap. xix. 1---7.

It has been the opinion of ſome eminent men who ſtudied the ſcriptures with great judgment, application and ſucceſs, that if our forefathers, who had the management of the proteſtant Reformation, had enjoyed the lights and aids with which ſucceeding times have been favoured, and could have diveſted themſelves of their ſcholaſtic manner of reaſoning, the differences on which the ſeveral churches where they preſided, ſeparated from each other, might have been, in a great meaſure, prevented. If this is true or even probable, much edification may ſtill ariſe from clearing up the genuine ſenſe of ſcripture, and freeing it from thoſe miſtaken interpretations, which unſkilful men firſt adopted, and others, intereſted in the credit of particular churches, have ſince thought fit to maintain, in ſome caſes, perhaps, contrary to their own inward conviction. Private chriſtians at leaſt will be led by this information, to diſtinguiſh between truth, and the mere apparition of it; between the genuine word of God, and the traditions of men;

and

and may thence be inſtructed, what few ſeem to be aware of, how much depends upon their ſtudying the ſcriptures for themſelves, and how liable they are to be impoſed upon by thoſe who think of little in their obſervations on the ſacred writers, but how they may beſt ſerve the ſyſtem of the ſociety to which they belong, or ſome hypotheſis of their own, ſtill more precarious than that.

They who after the moſt diligent ſearch, cannot find in the ſcriptures, any foundation for the doctrine of a ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, or any trace of an intermediate ſtate of life and conſciouſneſs between death and the reſurrection, think themſelves ſufficiently juſtified by the foregoing conſiderations, not only in their diſowning this doctrine themſelves, but in their endeavours to have it diſowned by all good chriſtians, as productive of nothing better, than ſuperſtition, idolatry and enthuſiaſm on the one hand, and infidelity on the other: and they apprehend that by admitting life and immortality to have been brought to light by the goſpel

of Chriſt, in the ſtrict and proper meaning of the words, and excluſive of all other means and ſources of immortality, (as St. *Paul* and his contemparies appear to have underſtood the doctrine) a total lapſe muſt enſue of the chief ſupports of Deiſm and Popery, not to mention other tranſactions of more recent original.

Theſe, we own, are high-ſounding pretenſions, but they are at the ſame time pretenſions of real importance to the cauſe of chriſtianity in general, and that of the Proteſtant religion in particular; and, on that account, demand from every one who is well affected to either, a candid and ſerious attention to thoſe arguments which are brought to make them good. There are, it is true, other arguments againſt Popery and infidelity, which have been urged againſt them with ſucceſs: but it is equally true that the arguments on the other ſide have received a great degree of plauſibility, and even of real weight, from the conceſſion of a *ſeparate exiſtence* of the ſoul in a ſtate of conſciouſneſs and activity.

For

For example, if it be denied, and cannot be proved that man will inherit eternal life, otherwiſe than in conſequence of his riſing from the dead, as that is inſured by the promiſes of the Goſpel, and the previous reſurrection of Jeſus, the faith and hope of that ſpecies of infidelity called *Deiſm*, are at end. But while chriſtian writers are perſuaded that they ought to maintain the natural, indefeaſible immortality of the ſoul, and its conſcious exiſtence in a ſeparate ſtate, as if this doctrine were ſome way connected with the principles of the chriſtian religion, they leave the Deiſts in poſſeſſion of a ſtrong-hold, from whence it ſeems impoſſible to diſlodge them. For thus they reaſon, " You allow that a future " ſtate of reward and puniſhment may " be proved from the nature of the hu- " man ſoul, from the unequal diſtribu- " tion of good and evil in the preſent " life, from the free agency of man, " and the documents of reaſon and na- " ture, importing that upon the final " event of things, the judge of all the

" earth

" earth will certainly do right. What
" neceſſity then for a particular revelati-
" on, or a particular mediator, to in-
" form us of, or to ſecure to us certain
" privileges of which we were in poſſeſ-
" ſion without them."

I am not the only one who hath obſerved and pitied the embaraſſment of the moſt eminent advocates of chriſtianity, when this objection was urged home upon them. In vain had they proved the *truth* and *authenticity* of the chriſtian revelation, by what is called the *external evidence*, even to demonſtration; in vain had they ſhewn, from the moral doctrines of the Goſpel, an agreement with the moſt rational concluſions of wiſe men in all ages, unleſs they could ſhew the *peculiar uſes* and *importance* of ſuch a diſpenſation. To what purpoſe ſuch a profuſion of miracles, ſo eminently powerful a miniſter, ſo tranſcendent a character as that of *Jeſus* at the head of this diſpenſation, if his errand was no more than to give an *additional* teſtimony to the ſuppoſed diſcoveries of natural religion? which,

which, conſidering the univerſal conſent of wiſemen in all ages, ſo much boaſted of on all ſides, and by both parties, ſeems to be an end much below the neceſſity for the interpoſition of *the Son of God*, as it might have been accompliſhed by the miniſtry of any one of thoſe inferior prophets of the Old Teſtament, who ſurely were ſufficiently gifted and inſtructed to authenticate doctrines and precepts, which were already to be found in the works of ſo many poets and philoſophers, in every bodies hands? And yet this, in ſhort, is the whole to which the account given us of the *cui bono* of revelation by moſt of our modern advocates for chriſtianity, ſeems to amount.

Let us now conſider another caſe. The notion of two natures or principles in man independent of each other, is plainly the foundation upon which our modern pietiſts of various denominations, build their reſpective ſyſtems. They conceive the influences of divine grace to operate upon the ſoul *only*, while the body remains under all the melancholy diſtemperature of its

its *original* corruption; which however is underſtood to have no ill effect upon the ſalvation of the believer, while his wounds, inflicted by carnality and concupiſcence, are healed by *faith*. Hence, inſtead of conſidering the purification of the *whole man*, as the work of a gradual inſtruction and diſcipline under the precepts of the Goſpel, they hold that the redemption, juſtification, ſanctification, &c. of particulars is *inſtantaneous*, upon the firſt act or motion of faith and repentance, and ſome of their writers ſeem to ſpeak of theſe privileges, as if they were even previous to converſion. This they call the *new birth*, which is ſuppoſed to cleanſe the ſoul from every ſtain of ſin; the blame of all obliquity and deviation from the precepts of the Goſpel being thrown upon the *old man*, whoſe malignity (being controuled by the inceſſant operations of *faith)* is however happily prevented from doing any harm to the purified ſpirit of believers.

This ſcheme of doctrine, with a thouſand extravagant conſequences drawn from it,

it, could evidently have no place but upon the ſuppoſition of two diſtinct natures in man, proped up by the application of certain paſſages of ſcripture torn from their context, and wreſted from their true meaning, in order to accommodate them to the Pagan accounts of the nature and properties of the human ſoul *(z)*.

(z) Theſe miſapplications ariſe chiefly from the mention made in the ſcriptures of an oppoſition or contrariety between *fleſh* and *ſpirit*, concerning which the learned *Pearſon* hath left us the following admonition. "Quid σαρξ quid "πνευμα apud Græcos ſcriptores denotet, nemo neſcit; "at ſi omnes in univerſum ſenſus, quibus his vocabulis "Græci uſi ſunt, recenſeantur, nullus omnino invenietur "qui mentem apoſtolorum attinget. Cum enim *baſhar* car-"nem proprie ſignificet, eadem tamen vox ab Hebræis non-"nunquam pro *homine ipſo*, aliquando pro *humana natura*, "ſæpe pro ejuſdem *imbecillitate*, aut etiam *vitioſitate*, uſur-"petur, et in hæc ſenſuum varietate unica voce σαρκος a "LXX reddatur, hinc evenire neceſſe eſt, ut quoties apoſtoli "eo ſenſu uſurpent quem Græci veteres haud agnoverunt, "ex Hebræo idiomate, et verſione LXX explicetur.---Ita "cum *ruach* ſatis proprie πνευμα, qualiter a veteribus Græcis "uſurpatur, denotet, et præterea etiam apud Hebræos "multa alia ſignificata contineat, quæ apud Græcos haud "comparent, cum apoſtoli eo ſenſu uſurpârunt quem Græci "veteres haud agnoverunt, ex Hebræo idiomate et verſione "LXX explicandi ſunt." *Præfat. Parænet.* before *Grabe's* Septuagint. Vid. etiam Gatakeri. Diſſ. de Stylo Nov. Inſtr. p. 55. et 56. How little have theſe diſtinctions of this able judicious critic been attended to by thoſe, who have commented upon, or drawn up ſyſtems from the paſſages in the apoſtolic writings here referred to? That they who, in interpreting the ſcriptures, pretend to the aid of immediate inſpiration, or go by the rules of different kinds of *cabbaliſm*, ſhould

To do juſtice however to all ſides, it muſt be obſerved that theſe viſionaries allege, "they are but treading in the "footſteps of our predeceſſors of the "eſtabliſhment, and analyſing the very "ſyſtem to which every orthodox ſon "of the church of *England* ſubſcribes "his *unfeigned aſſent* to this very day." And they ſcruple not to boaſt, that they have the ſatisfaction to ſee, that after all the clamour raiſed againſt them, the moſt dextrous of their reverend, and even right reverend opponents, is obliged in overturning their creed, to quibble away his own; in which, *I would willingly hope*, they are miſtaken.

What intereſt Popery has in the determination of this queſtion, is ſhewn at

hold theſe rational criticiſms in contempt, is not marvelous. But that they who pretend to read and explain the ſcriptures by the help of grammatical and philological literature, ſhould overlook theſe neceſſary intimations, is unaccountable. To ſome of theſe therefore, and particularly to the author of *Two Letters* on the *Intermediate State*, would I humbly recommend the deliberate conſideration of biſhop *Pearſon*'s remark above cited, before they expoſe their ignorance in concluding from a fameneſs or ſimilarity of expreſſion, that *Moſes*, *David*, *Solomon*, *Paul*, &c. &c. had preciſely the ſame idea of the *human ſoul*, with, *Heſiod*, *Homer*, *Pythagoras*, *Cicero*, and other worthies of the Pagan ages.

large

large in the following *Hiſtorical View*, where it will be ſeen, that while our Reformers were ſtudiouſly lopping the branches of ſuperſtition and impoſture, they inadvertently left the ſtock, with a vigorous root in the ground, which their ſucceſſors, with a ſurprizing inattention to the pernicious conſequences of their miſapprehenſion, have been cultivating to a freſh growth, to the great hazard not only of the proteſtant religion, but even of Chriſtianity itſelf, which is at this hour well nigh choaked and obſcured under the thick ſhade of this venomous exotic.

By this time the intelligent reader will readily comprehend, that a doctrine, which, like that of *the ſleep of the ſoul*, ſtrikes ſo home at the pride of the philoſopher, the enthuſiaſtic viſions of the myſtic, the lucrative ſyſtems of the intereſted churchman, and the various prejudices and ſuperſtitions of their reſpective diſciples, ſhould be loaded with all the obloquy and ſcandal which bigotted and provoked adverſaries can lay upon it. We are in-

deed obliged to thoſe who content themſelves with calling it an unimportant, inſignificant doctrine; for though their moderation ariſes from too ſuperficial a knowledge of the ſubject, to give weight to their judgment, yet it is candid at leaſt to confeſs, that *they ſee no harm in it*. The far greater part agree in ſtigmatizing it as an hereſy, derogatory to the nature of man, ſubverſive of his future hopes, and ſavouring not a little of atheiſm and impiety.

In vain have the eſpouſers of this opinion remonſtrated againſt theſe unjuſt and cruel cenſures. In vain have they offered themſelves to be tried by the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, and the tenor of the Chriſtian diſpenſation therein exhibited. In vain have they aſſerted their firm belief of a reſurrection of the dead through *Chriſt* the redeemer, and acknowledged their obligations to him of duty and gratitude for the grace and privileges of his goſpel. Not the leaſt regard has been paid to their moſt ſolemn profeſſionson this head. Their opponents

ſtill

ſtill go on to charge them with endeavouring to ſink mankind to the condition of beaſts that periſh, without making the leaſt allowance for their holding, what is equally admitted by both parties, a reſtoration of the defunct to life and immortality, by a reſurrection of the dead.

It is in order to ſhew this unrighteous and unchriſtian treatment in its proper colours, and to lodge an appeal againſt it, with thoſe who have candour and temper enough to look farther for the grounds of ſuch accuſations, than the ecchoes of an injudicious multitude, inflamed by the injurious miſrepreſentations of their intereſted leaders, that the following detail of facts is drawn up, and ſubmitted to the conſideration of the public.

It is remarkable that Proteſtants, who have on moſt occaſions refuſed to be governed by *tradition*, ſeem to have ſubmitted to it in this matter with the moſt implicit deference; and ſome of the ſame men, who in treating upon other theological

theological ſubjects, are wont to preſs a thorough examination of popular opinions, and exhort us to receive nothing upon the mere merit of its long poſſeſſion, and the concurrence of numbers, have affected to repreſent the natural immortality of the ſoul, not only as an *univerſal*, but an *uniform* tenet of mankind in all ages and countries, and in all circumſtances. And there is no doubt but thouſands adhere to the opinion at this very time, who have no other argument to produce for it, but this of an univerſal and uniform concurrence.

But is this the truth of the caſe? Does it, or can it be made to appear, that men were *uniform* in all ages, either in their notions concerning the ſort of ſoul intituled to immortality, or the kind of immortality to which it is intituled? No, the diſputes on this head are carefully concealed in all popular diſcourſes; and the people are left to take a thing for granted, in which, were their teachers called upon to explain the terms they uſe,

uſe, hardly two of them perhaps would agree in the ſame definitions.

The late Mr. *Grove* of *Taunton*, being hard preſſed by Mr. *Hallet*, junior, upon this ſubject, began a work, concerning *The weight of tradition for a future ſtate*, of which he lived to finiſh only one chapter. The title is ambiguous, nor is it clear from what remains, upon what Mr. *Grove* would have reſted his argument. The *weight* of tradition may mean, the ſuperior numbers who have given their ſuffrage for a future ſtate in times paſt, and the *comparative* weight of theſe, when put in the oppoſite ſcale to thoſe who have argued and concluded againſt it. Or the *weight of tradition* may ſignifie the *real intrinſic importance* of tradition, in deciding the queſtion concerning a future ſtate.

If Mr. *Grove* intended to treat his ſubject upon the latter footing, no doubt but he would take the ſuperiority of numbers for granted; a point which would not be worth diſputing with him. But if in the latter ſenſe, he could hard-

ly

ly avoid obſerving how greatly the weight of tradition would be diminiſhed, by the various and diſagreeing accounts of the things itſelf, by which this tradition has been handed down, not only in different ages, but in the ſame age, and even in the ſame country.

The following papers are deſigned to afford a ſhort, but, as it is hoped, a ſatisfactory view of the *weight* of tradition for a future ſtate, in the ſenſe of *merit* and *importance*, during a particular period of time, the moſt intereſting to the preſent generation (with reſpect to queſtions of this kind) of any other; as abounding not only with more and better materials for reſearches into philoſophical opinions, through the revival and cultivation of uſeful literature, but productive likewiſe of many more eminent men, who with different views, and from various motives, have employed their talents in this diſquiſition.

Such of theſe as appear to be moſt worthy of our regard we ſhall call upon to ſpeak for themſelves, leaving innumerable

rable others unnoticed, not as being upon the whole leſs conſiderable, but as men who have only repeated what ſome or other of our witneſſes have ſaid before or after them.

And if, upon the reſult, it ſhall appear, that there has been no manner of conſiſtency among thoſe who have dogmatized upon the natural immortality, or ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul; if it ſhall appear that later inquiries have exploded and reprobated former theories, and that men who have ſeemingly agreed in aſſerting the general doctrine, have flatly contradicted each other in ſetting forth the grounds of it, and conſequently in the conſtruction of their arguments brought to ſupport it, may we not humbly hope that the offence that has been taken at thoſe who have diſſented from them all, and have refuſed to adopt any accounts of futurity except thoſe in the New Teſtament, will now ceaſe; and that our impartial readers will not think it ſtrange or unreaſonable, that we who think a ſtate of *ſeparate exiſtence* of the

ſoul derogatory to the word of God, ſhould not receive it with a blind ſubmiſſion to the *ipſe dixit* of men, who, however conſiderable in other reſpects, could never ſatisfy each other in their reſpective accounts of a doctrine, which all of them pretended to believe?

I have only farther to add, that as the Church of *England* herſelf, hath declined in the moſt ſolemn declaration of her tenets, to interpoſe her judgment of this controverſy for more than two hundred years, and gives countenance to the notion of a *conſcious intermediate ſtate*, no otherwiſe than by ſome ambiguous expreſſions in one of her offices, which of all others, and by the confeſſion of all parties, wants moſt to be corrected; it is not only *unfair* but *inhuman* for one ſett of her members to brand another with HERESY, merely for holding the negative ſide of this queſtion. It is indeed to exceed in bitterneſs even the gall of Popery itſelf; the moſt ſenſible and reaſonable men of that communion ſpeaking with great contempt and indigna-

tion

ion of thoſe who impute *hereſy* to their adverſaries in points, which are not decided by the CHURCH. And were they who are *dignified* with the name of *Soul-ſleepers*, diſpoſed to ſeek repriſals upon the *Orthodox*, what depredations might they not make, by comparing ſome of their *avowed* opinions with the correſponding *Articles* of the Church, which they have ſolemnly ſubſcribed more than once, and which are ſtill ſtanding in full authority to confront them.

The End of the Preface.

A SHORT

HISTORICAL VIEW

OF THE

CONTROVERSY, &c.

SECT. I.

BEFORE the council of *Florence*, which was held in the year 1439, under pope *Eugenius* IV, the current doctrine, both of the Greek and Latin churches, was, that "the ſouls of the ſaints were in *abditis receptaculis*, or as ſome of them expreſſed it, *in exterioribus atriis*, where they expected the "reſurrection of their bodies, and the glorification of their ſouls; and though the Fathers "believed all of them to be happy, yet they "did not think they would enjoy the beatific "viſion before the reſurrection (*a*)." 1439.

But the pope abovementioned, having by an infamous ſtratagem, and in oppoſition to the council of *Baſil*, inveigled the patriarch of *Conſtantinople* and ſome of his clergy, to attend him in a council indicted at *Ferrara*, and adjourned

(*a*) See Biſhop *Taylor*'s Liberty of Propheſying, p. 152.

to *Florence* (*b*), had the addreſs to obtain their conſent to the following canon.

" If the truly penitent ſhall depart this life in " the love of God, before they have made ſuffi- " cient ſatisfaction for their ſins of commiſſion " and omiſſion, by fruits worthy of repentance, " their ſouls are purged by the pains of purga- " tory; and the ſuffrages of the living are pro- " fitable for the relieving them from the pains " of purgatory, namely, by ſacrifices of the " maſs, prayers, and alms, which according to " the ordinances of the church, are wont to be " performed by the faithful, on the behalf of " the faithful; but the ſouls of thoſe, who, " after baptiſm, have incurred no ſtain of ſin, " as alſo thoſe ſouls, which having contracted " the ſtain of ſin, whether in their bodies or " diveſted of their bodies, have been purged " as abovementioned, *are received into heaven* " *immediately, and clearly behold the triune God* " *as he is*; but ſome of them more perfectly " than others, according to the difference of " their merits (*c*)."

The compilers of this canon ſaw, no doubt, the abſurdity of ſuppoſing that thoſe ſouls which had undergone the purgatorial purification, ſhould ſtill remain *in abditis receptaculis*, perhaps in a ſtate of inſenſibility, as ſome of the Fathers held, or *in exterioribus atriis*, in a ſtate of mere ex-

(*b*) *Geddes* Introductory Diſcourſe, prefixed to *Vargas*'s Letters. And the Greek Hiſtory of this Council publiſhed by *Creyghton*, 1660.

(*c*) *Caranza* Sum. Concil. 454. f. v. 12mo.

pectation.

pectation. But purgatory was to be ſupported at all events, and the poor Greeks, on this occaſion, were obliged to deſert the moſt eminent lights of their own church, for which, however, ſome of them were ſufficiently mortified when they got home (*d*)."

But that the proteſtants ſhould be complaiſant enough to make *this plain receſſion from antiquity*, as biſhop *Taylor* terms it, upon no better authority than that of this canon, is a little ſurprizing. This, however, is the fact, as will evidently appear by and by, with this difference, that theſe proteſtants ſent the ſouls of the ſaints directly to heaven, without calling at purgatory.

It is probable this alteration in the church's doctrine, might give occaſion to the philoſophical inquiries and diſputes we read of no long time after, in the city of Rome itſelf, concerning the

(*d*) *Joſeph* the patriarch died at *Florence* ſuddenly in the night, having juſt time to leave a reſcript behind him, importing his full agreement with the church of *Rome*, particularly in the articles of the Roman pontiff's ſupremacy, and the doctrine of purgatory. This was well contrived, and was no doubt inſtrumental to the procuring the ſubſcription of his aſſociates. Who however were not only diſowned by the church of *Conſtantinople* when they returned, but, if we may believe *Gaſpar Peucerus*, [Chronic. *ſub anno* 1439] excommunicated, and denied chriſtian burial. *Platina* ſays, *Græcorum natio, haud ita multo poſt, ad antiquos mores recidit.* Eugen. iv. p. 267. Edit. 1562. But indeed they did not think themſelves bound for a ſingle moment by this act of their Florentine delegates. There was however ſome ſtruggle to have the union of the Greek and Latin churches, as patched up at *Florence*, received by the ſynod at Conſtantinople but without ſucceſs. Vid. Sguropol. Hiſt. Con. Florent. at the end.

immortality of the ſoul. Theſe diſputes afforded one pretence at leaſt to pope Paul II. to aboliſh the college of *Abbreviators*, and to perſecute the members of it, of whom *Platina* was one, and the celebrated *Pomponius Lætus* another. The pope objected to them that they diſputed upon the immortality of the ſoul, and held *Plato*'s opinion upon that ſubject, which *Platina* did not deny, but juſtifies himſelf and his fellows by the authority of St *Auſtin*, who thought *Plato*'s doctrine reſembled that of the chriſtian religion. Says the pope, " You give occaſion by your diſputations, to call in queſtion the being of GOD."---*Platina* anſwers, *that this might be equally objected to all the divines and philoſophers of thoſe times, who for diſputation's ſake, and for the purpoſe of finding out the truth, called in queſtion the being and nature of ſouls, of* GOD, *and of all ſeperate intelligences (e).*

This happened in the pontificate of *Paul* II. which began in the year 1464, and ended, 1471, And I cite it only to ſhew that ſuch diſputes were on foot in thoſe days, and that they were ſuppoſed to do harm to religion.

II.

1513. The ſpirit of philoſophizing however ſeems to have gone on without much controul, from this period to the year 1513, when the immortality of the ſoul being openly called in queſtion *(f)*,

(e) Platina in *Paulo.* 2^do^.

(f) Sleidan. Lib. 2. p. 37.

it

it became neceſſary for the pope and the church to give ſome check to it; which was done in a canon enacted in what may be called the *rump* of the Lateran council, held under Leo X. in the year abovementioned *(g)*.

It will be neceſſary to put down this canon at length, as it is publiſhed by *Caranza*.

" Whereas in theſe our days, ſome have dared " to aſſert concerning the nature of the reaſon- " able ſoul, that it is mortal, or one and the

(g) Luther ſays of this council, that it was of ſo little authority as to be laughed at by the Romaniſts themſelves. *Sleidan*, u. 5. p. 35.

Cum diebus noſtris nonnulli auſi ſint dicere de natura animæ rationalis, quod mortalis ſit aut unica in cunctis hominibus, et aliqui temere philoſophantes, ſecundum ſaltem philoſophiam verum eſſe aſſeverant, ſacro approbante concilio damnamus et reprobamus, omnes aſſerentes animam intellectivam mortalem eſſe aut unicam in cunctis hominibus, et hæc in dubium vertentes; cum illa non ſolum vere et per ſe et eſſentialiter humani corporis forma exiſtat (ſicut in Can. Clementis Papæ 5. in generali Viennenſi concilio edito continetur) verum immortalis et pro corporum quibus infunditur multitudine, ſingulariter multiplicabilis, et multiplicata, et multiplicanda ſit. Quod manifeſte conſtat ex evangelio, cum Dominus ait, *Animam autem occidere non poſſunt*. Et alibi, *Qui odit animam ſuam in hoc mundo*, &c. Et etiam cum æternam pænam (l. æterna præmia) et æterna ſupplicia pro merito vitæ judicandis repromittit : alias incarnatio, et alia Chriſti myſteria nobis minime profuiſſent, nec reſurrectio expectanda foret, ac ſancti et juſti miſerabiliores eſſent, juxta Paulum, omnibus hominibus. Cumque *verum vero minime contradicat*, omnem aſſertionem veritati illuminatæ fidei contrariam, omnino falſam eſſe definimus, et ut aliter dogmatizare non liceat diſtrictius inhibemus, omneſque hujuſmodi erroneis aſſertionibus inhærentes, tanquam hæreticos vitandos et puniendos fore decernimus. *Caranza*. Sum. Concilior. *Lovanii*. 1681. pag. 412. b. 413. a.

ſame

" ſame in all men; and ſome, raſhly philoſo-
" phizing, declare this to be true, at leaſt ac-
" cording to philoſophy, We, with the appro-
" bation of the ſacred council, do condemn and
" reprobate all thoſe who aſſert that the intel-
" lectual ſoul is mortal, or one and the ſame
" in all men, and thoſe who call theſe things in
" queſtion; ſeeing that the ſoul is not only truly,
" and of itſelf, and eſſentially the form of the
" human body, as is expreſſed in the canon of
" pope *Clement* Vth, publiſhed in the general
" council of *Vienne*; but likewiſe immortal,
" and, according to the number of bodies into
" which it is infuſed, is ſingularly multipliable,
" multiplied, and to be multiplied. Which
" manifeſtly appears from the goſpel, ſeeing
" that our Lord ſaith, *They cannot kill the ſoul:*
" and elſewhere, *He who hateth his ſoul in this*
" *world*, &c. and alſo becauſe he promiſes
" eternal pain (*rather* rewards) and eternal tor-
" ments to thoſe who are to be judged accord-
" ing to their merit in this life. OTHER-
" WISE the incarnation, and other myſteries of
" Chriſt, would not profit us, nor were a re-
" ſurrection to be expected; and the ſaints
" and righteous would, according to *Paul*, be
" moſt miſerable of all men. And ſeeing that
" *truth never contradicts truth*, we determine
" every aſſertion, which is contrary to revealed
" faith, to be falſe; and we ſtrictly inhibit all
" from dogmatizing otherwiſe, and we decree
" that all who adhere to the like erroneous aſ-
" ſertions, ſhall be ſhuned and puniſhed as
" heretics."

This

This venerable council, it appears, were of opinion, that if the human ſoul was proved or allowed to be naturally mortal, there could be no reſurrection of the dead, no rewards or puniſhments in a future ſtate, no benefits from the incarnation, and other myſteries of Chriſt (one of which OTHER myſteries by the way, was a *purgatory (h)*. And the axiom, *verum vero non contradicit*; applied as it is in this canon, imports, that the ſcholaſtic argument for the immortality of the ſoul, and the ſcripture-revelation of a reſurrection of the dead, muſt either be both true, or both falſe.

It is true, the ſubſtantial forms of the *Thomiſts* are no longer in repute, and the argument drawn from thence for the immortality of the ſoul, is, *in theſe more enlightened days*, exploded. But that is only to make way for another *ſcholaſtic* argument, equally obſcure and precarious, deviſed by *Des Cartes*, and adopted by many good Chriſtians and *true* Proteſtants to this hour, who are juſt as poſitive as *Leo* and his Doctors, that the philoſophical and evangelical arguments for immortality, ſtand upon the ſame foundation. In ſupport of which notion, a doctor of our own of no inconſiderable figure, hath introduced our bleſſed Saviour, deducing his argument for a reſurrection of the dead, againſt the *Sadducees*, Matt. xxii. 29. through the *medium* of the SEPARATE EXISTENCE

(h) *Aquinas* infers the ſoul's capability of purgatorial pains, from it's being the ſubſtantial form of the body. *Aquin.* Summ. qu. LXXV. art. 1. reſp. ad 5^{tam} 1. partis.

of

of the ſoul *(i)*. What a million of pities that ſuch a diſcovery ſhould eſcape the ſagacity of *Leo* and his *Lateran* counc ilors!

III.

1516. But to go on with facts. *Peter Pomponatius* a philoſopher of *Mantua*, not at all intimidated by this *Lateran* thunder, publiſhed a book in the year 1516, on the immortality of the ſoul, in which he expoſed the futility of that argumentation by which the followers of *Ariſtotle* had endeavoured to prove the immortality of the ſoul on the principles of their maſter; by ſhewing that they either miſtook the ſenſe of *Ariſtotle*'s principles, or drew wrong concluſions from them. He then examines the hypotheſis of *Ariſtotle* himſelf, and ſhews, that the mortality of the ſoul may be as eaſily proved by it, as the contrary. After which he ſtates the moral arguments for the immortality, or rather againſt the mortality of the ſoul, under eight heads, and having ſhewn that they are weak and inconcluſive, he infers upon the whole, in his laſt chapter, that "the immor-
"tality of the ſoul, being a problematical
"queſtion, we can have no aſſurance of the
"thing, but from revelation, and that they who
"would build immortality upon any other foun-
"dation, only verifie the character given to cer-
"tain ſelf-ſufficient reaſoners by the apoſtle,

(i) Div. Leg. of *Moſes*. Vol. IV. p. 343. ed. 1758.

namely,

" namely, *profeſſing themſelves wiſe, they be-*
" *came fools (k).*"

It

(k) The R. R. author of the *Divine Legation* of *Moſes*, &c. cenſures Mr. *Bayle* for miſrepreſenting *Pomponatius*, by placing him in the claſs of thoſe who have thought religion uſeleſs to ſociety, which he calls *an impiety*. Whereas according to the R. R. author, *the impiety* of which *Pomponatius* was guilty, was, the pretence that *religion* was the creature of the magiſtrate. D. L. B. 1. I will venture to ſay the R. R. author miſrepreſents *Pomponatius* as much to the full as Mr. *Bayle*. In this philoſopher's XIV chapter we meet with the following paſſage. " Nam quod communiter di-
" citur, ſi anima eſt mortalis, homo deberet ſe totum tra-
" dere voluptatibus corporalibus, omnia mala committere
" ad ſui utilitatem, vanumque eſſet Deum colere, divina
" honorare, preces ad Deum fundere, ſacrificia facere, cæ-
" teraque hujus generis; ſatis reſponſio patet per ea quæ
" dicta ſunt; nam cum naturaliter felicitas appetatur, et
" miſeria fugiatur, et per dicta, felicitas conſiſtat in actu
" virtuoſo, cum ex tota mente Deum colere, divina hono-
" rare, fundere at Deum preces, ſacrificare, ſint actus max-
" ime virtuoſi, ideo debemus totis viribus inniti, ad acqui-
" ſitionem iſtorum, p. 138." Now this being the religion of the firſt claſs of men he had mentioned before, p. 123. *qui ad virtutem inducuntur* EX SOLA VIRTUTIS NOBILITATE, without *any* inducement from the magiſtrate; with what truth could the R. R. author affirm that *Pomponatius*, pretended *religion to be the creature of politics?* Unleſs he will ſay that *to worſhip God with the whole heart, to pray to him*, &c. are not *religion*. Ay! but by *religion* the R. R. author meant only *future rewards and puniſhments*. So it ſeems. But if the whole of religion conſiſts in *theſe ſanctions*, will it not follow upon this author's own principles, that *Moſes* taught the Jews *no religion at all?* Well then, we allow that *Pomponatius* held future rewards and puniſhments to be the creature of politics. But where is the *impiety* of this? For if as *Pomponatius* aſſerts, we can have no certainty of immortality but from *revelation*, or the canonical ſcriptures, I would deſire to know of the R. R.

 author,

It is no wonder that theſe *mootings* ſhould expoſe *Pomponatius* to the rage and abuſe of the popiſh clergy of all denominations. In vain did he pretend to ſubmit his lucubrations to the controul of the apoſtolic ſee. He had claſſed *Ariſtotle*, and the whole tribe of ſchoolmen, among the *wiſemen who became fools* in their own ſelf-ſufficiency; and upon theſe did the moſt lucrative doctrines of *Rome* almoſt entirely depend. But the ſtrange part of the ſtory would be, that this writer ſhould incur the diſpleaſure of the Proteſtants, for oppoſing the doctrine of a popiſh canon, if later experience had not convinced us how complaiſant we have been to the *catholics* in theſe points, ſince thoſe days. Heretic, Impious, Epicurean, Atheiſt, were liberally beſtowed upon *Pomponatius* on this occaſion, with how little juſtice has been ſhewn by Mr. *Bayle*. And we ſhall ſee, as we go a-

author, whoſe creatures thoſe *future* rewards and puniſhments muſt be, which were propoſed to the Pagans by the ruling powers among them, and which had no connection with revelation? And it is of *ſuch* future rewards and puniſhments only that *Pomponatius* ſpeaks, and of which he ſays, in the paſſage referred to by the R. R. author, that they were the invention of politicians. Henceforward then, *Pomponatius* is acquitted of all impiety, except it be *impiety* againſt *human* eſtabliſhments of religion, with which indeed he plainly enough declares neither the religion of the goſpel, nor the religion of philoſophers can poſſibly incorporate. How far he is in the right is another queſtion. But without doubt the R. R. author had his reaſons for being diſpleaſed with the conſequences that might be drawn from the doctrine of our *Mantuan* philoſopher, as totally ſubverſive of the *ingenious* principles of his *alliance*, &c.

long

long, that ſeveral eminent men have adopted *Pomponatius*'s general principle, in contradiction to a certain ſort of philoſophy, in much higher reputation for the ſuppoſed perſpicuity of its grounds, than that of *Ariſtotle* and *Aquinas*.

One of *Pomponatius*'s ſyllogiſms is this, "If "Chriſt is raiſed from the dead, we ſhall like-"wiſe riſe; and if we riſe, the ſoul is immor-"tal: But Chriſt is raiſed: THEREFORE "the ſoul is immortal."

Conſidering what was meant in thoſe days by *the immortality of the ſoul*, the conſequence is weak, and the reaſoning pitiful. This however ought to have ſatisfied the philoſopher's adverſaries that he was neither atheiſt nor heretic. But the objection lay here; this ſyllogiſm did not account for the *intermediate* immortality in a ſtate of ſeparate exiſtence. Nothing is mentioned of the *ſubſtantial form*, on which, as we have obſerved, the ſoul's capability of purgatorial pains was made to depend *.

I have often wondered that the modern contenders for the *ſeparate exiſtence* of the ſoul, ſhould ever be prevailed with to give up this commodious *ſubſtantial form:* or that none of the numerous followers of *Des Cartes*, *Clarke*, and *Baxter*, ſhould think of ſubſtituting ſomething in the room of it. When they ſpeak of the *happineſs* of ſeparate ſouls, they make a

* Quantumcunque immateriale in materiale agat, non videtur tamen actionem converti. Quare et etiam apud Theologos dubitatio orta eſt, quomodo animæ cruciari poſſint ab igne corporeo. *Pompon.* cap. 8. p. 42.

tolerable caſe, and flouriſh on the ſpiritual joys of a *thinking ſubſtance*, with great edification to thoſe who are in love with myſtic rapture and exſtacy. But when they come to diſpoſe of the ſouls of the *wicked*, they are totally at a loſs. Some of them are obliged to leave them aſleep, [*Steffe*, &c.] Others talk of puniſhments by parity of reaſon, and of their ſuffering---no body knows what or how, [*Goddard*, &c.] It is very extraordinary they ſhould not recollect that their *catholic* predeceſſors, having *ſubſtantial forms* always at hand, were never under any ſuch embarraſſment.

IV.

1520. In the year 1520 *Luther* publiſhed a defence of his propoſitions condemned by a bull of *Leo* X. which were in number 41. The 27th runs thus.

" It is certain that it is not in the power of " the church or the Pope to eſtabliſh articles " of faith, or laws for morals or good works." And the reaſon he gives for this is, that theſe articles and laws, are already eſtabliſhed in the word of God; which he proves from 1 *Cor.* iii. 11 *(l)*. After which he goes on, " But I " permit

(l) Certum eſt in manu Eccleſiæ aut Papæ non eſſe ſtatuere articulos fidei, imo nec leges morum, nec bonorum operum.---Permitto tamen quod Papa condat articulos fidei ſibi et ſuis fidelibus, quales ſunt, *Panem et vinum tranſubſtantiari in ſacramento, Eſſentiam Dei nec generare, nec generari. Animam eſſe formam ſubſtantialem humani corporis. Se eſſe imperatorem mundi, et regem cœli, et Deum terrenum,*

" permit the Pope to make articles of faith " for himſelf and his faithful, ſuch as, *The* " *bread and wine are tranſubſtantiated in the ſa-* " *crament. The eſſence of God neither generates,* " *nor is generated. The ſoul is the ſubſtantial* " *form of the human body. The Pope is the em-* " *peror of the world, and the king of heaven,* " *and God upon earth.* THE SOUL IS IM- " MORTAL, with all thoſe monſtrous opinions " to be found in the Roman dunghill of de- " cretals, that ſuch as his faith is, ſuch may be " his goſpel, ſuch his diſciples, and ſuch his " church, that the mouth may have meat ſuit- " able for it, and the diſh, a cover worthy of " it."

This ironical permiſſion of *Luther* is evidently aimed at thoſe decrees of the Popes, which were founded upon ſcholaſtic determinations *(m)*. But more particularly at that *Lateran* canon abovementioned, which eſtabliſhed the immortality of the ſoul after *Aquinas*, in

terrenum. ANIMAM ESSE IMMORTALEM; et omnia illa infinita portenta in Romano ſterquilinio decretorum, ut qualis eſt ejus fides, tale ſit evangelium, tales et fideles, talis et eccleſia, et [l. ut.] habeant ſimilem labra lactucam, et dignum patella ſit operculum.---*Aſſertio articulorum omnium* Martini Lutheri, *per bullam* Leonis X. *damnatorum.* Oper. Tom. ii. fol. 107. Wittembergæ, 1562.

(m) The axiom, that, *The eſſence of God neither generates nor is generated*, is a ſentence of *Lombard*, which being controverted by the Abbot *Joachim*, as heretical and abſurd, was patronized and decreed in the *Lateran* council held under *Innocent* III, in the year 1215, where *Joachim* was formally condemned. *Lombard*'s propoſition was afterwards eſpouſed and vindicated by *Aquinas*.

conſequence

conſequence of its being the ſubſtantial form of the body. *Sylveſter Prierias*, in his diſpute with *Luther*, relied almoſt wholly on the authority of St. *Thomas*, whom *Luther* in his replication, treated with the utmoſt contempt *(n)*. Hence may ariſe a doubt whether *Luther* in this paſſage, intended only to reprobate the *ſchool doctrine* of the immortality of the ſoul, or to deny the thing itſelf?

Cardinal *du Perron*, ſuppoſes *Luther* denied the immortality of the ſoul, for the ſake of the effect the contrary doctrine would have upon the practice of invocating ſaints *(o)*. But it is certain that *Luther* himſelf had not quite laid aſide the practice of invocation, at the time he wrote this defence of his articles *(p)*.

Afterwards indeed *Luther* eſpouſed the doctrine of the ſleep of the ſoul, upon a ſcripture foundation, and *then* he made uſe of it as a confutation of purgatory and ſaint worſhip, and continued in that belief to the laſt moment of his life.

I know this hath been controverted even by ſome of his own followers. The queſtion upon many accounts, is worth debating; and as the diſcuſſion of it would break the thread of our preſent diſquiſition, I ſhall reſerve what I have to ſay upon the ſubject, for an *Appendix*; obſerving that *Luther* in his commentary upon

(n) *Sleidan*, lib. 1.
(o) *Perroniana*, motte LUTHER.
(p) *Seckendorff*, in Indice tertio ad annum 1521.

Eccleſiaſtes,

Eccleſiaſtes, which was publiſhed in the year 1532, was clearly and indiſputably on the ſide of thoſe who maintain the ſleep of the ſoul (*q*.)

V.

About this time, 1534, *Calvin* had begun to figure, and two years after *Luther* had publiſhed the commentary juſt mentioned, *Calvin* put out a ſmall tract at *Orleans*, which he intituled, *Pſychopannychia*, by which word is ſignified that the ſoul wakes throughout the whole night of death, with all the conſciouſneſs and ſenſibility neceſſary to the enjoyment of happineſs. 1534.

There is ſomething remarkable in the time and place of this publication.

In this very year 1534, and in this very city of *Orleans*, a ghoſt was conjured up by the *Franciſcans*, which played a number of pranks, much in the ſtyle of the late *Cock-lane* ſpirit, and with much the ſame views of ſpite and revenge (*r*). *Sleidan*, who tells the ſtory, having related how much the impoſtors were pitied and relieved, under their correction, by the populace, and particularly by the *good women*, proceeds to obſerve what excellent purpoſes of the eccleſiaſtical kind, were anſwered by theſe ſame ſpectres, particularly in ſupport-

(*q*) Vid. Append. p. 85.

(*r*) Rogatus quid vellet [Novicius] et quis eſſet? ſignificat non ſibi licere loqui. Jubetur ergo per ſigna reſpondere ad interrogata. Foramen erat factum, per quod admotis auribus, exorciſtæ vocem haurire poterat et intelligere. Deinde *tabulam* habebat ad manum, quam interrogatus, feriebat.

ing

ing the doctrine of purgatory, encouraging private maſſes, and bringing in large profits to the prieſts. "But, continues he, after *Luther*'s "doctrine came to be underſtood, and had "gained a little ſtrength, this kind of ſpec-"tres by degrees vaniſhed away. For *Luther* "teaches from the ſcriptures, that the ſouls of "the dead are at reſt, waiting for the final "day of judgment; and that thoſe diſtur-"bances, frightful noiſes and phantoms are "raiſed by Satan, who loſes no opportunity "of confirming men in the practice of im-"pious rites, and the belief of falſe opinions, "that he may render ineffectual the bleſſings "conferred upon us by our Saviour Chriſt (*s*)."

Now *Calvin* had compoſed his book ſeven years before its publication at *Orleans*; and why he ſhould chuſe this critical ſeaſon to diſcloſe theſe ſentiments, would be hard to ſay. Some part of this year he ſpent at *Paris*, and moſt probably he came not to *Orleans*, till the latter end of it. The juggle of the *Franciſcans*, and the proceſs againſt them, run out into a great length of time, and as this incident was conſiderable enough to find a place in *Sleidan*'s hiſtory, it could be no ſecret to *Calvin*. But admit that *Calvin*'s book made its appearance before the *Franciſcan* ſpectre; it is certain that *Luther*'s doctrine, mentioned by *Sleidan*, was ſtill earlier by ſome years; and it is equally certain, that in proportion as *Luther*'s principle

(*s*) Sleidan comment. L. IX. p. 239---242.

bore

bore down the trade of apparitions, that of *Calvin*, would encourage and promote it.

LUTHER, by conſigning *all* the dead to a ſtate of reſt and ſleep, left no pretence for the appearance of human ſouls after death. But *Calvin* managed his matters ſo, that though he was willing to ſuppoſe the ſouls of the elect, were in ſuch a ſtate of felicity, as would not admit of their being interrupted by worldly conſiderations; yet he left the ſons of perdition to their liberty. "For he ſays, it is nothing to him "what becomes of *their* ſouls; he would only "be reſponſible for the faithful *(t)*:" which I ſuppoſe has given the hint to all ſucceeding *Pſychopannychiſts* to be ſo exceeding ſhy of mentioning the condition of wicked ſouls in a ſeparate ſtate: fearing, as it ſhould ſeem, to burn their fingers in *purgatory*.

In the mean time, as all the ſpectres of the monks were manufactured out of theſe *wicked* ſouls, it was no contemptible favour to leave them acceſs to this reprobate groupe: one of theſe, has occaſionally been worth more to a church or a convent, than a dozen ſaints.

As to the book itſelf, it is hot, furious, and abuſive. The *Hypnologiſts*, as he calls them, are *bablers*, *madmen*, *dreamers*, *drunkards*; in one word, *Anabaptiſts* and *Catabaptiſts*, under which name he ſays, are comprehended all

(t) Quod ſi quis ipſorum adhuc obſtrepit, *Quid perditionis filiis futurum ſit?* Nihil ad nos. Ego pro fidelibus reſpondeo.---*Pſychopan* fol. 50. *of* the *Straſourgh* edition, 1545.

ſorts and kinds of wickedneſſes *(u)*. Happily for them, his arguments are as feeble and ſophiſtical as they themſelves could wiſh. Such as they are however, they have furniſhed all the orators and diſputants for the conſciouſneſs of the ſeparate ſoul, from that day to this, with ſcriptural authorities. For *Calvin* had ſo much wit in his anger, as not to meddle with the philoſophical arguments for immortality *(x)*.

But though he charges the Anabaptiſts with firſt broaching the doctrine of the ſleep of the ſoul, in theſe latter days, he is nevertheleſs obliged to own that ſome thouſands were in that way of thinking, and ſome of theſe good men; that is to ſay, *not* Anabaptiſts. Whence it appears that he very well knew this doctrine was no way connected with the pernicious extravagancies of theſe enthuſiaſts; though this he is diſingenuous enough to inſinuate in divers paſſages.

(u) And yet he has the modeſty to ſay in his ſecond preface, Quanquam nec contra eos [Anabaptiſtas] niſi MODICE bilem effudi; ut qui ab omni procacitate et loquendi petulantia PERPETUO abſtinuerim.

(x) "Valeant philoſophi, *ſays he*, quibus, cum in omnibus pene rebus ſolenne ſit, nec finem, nec modum facere diſſenſionibus; HIC ita inter ſe rixantur, ut vix duos teſtes habiturus ſis, in quacunque tandem opinione acquieſcas." He acknowledges however that *Plato* and *Ariſtotle* have diſcourſed excellently on the *faculties* of the ſoul, but that you would in vain conſult them for any juſt account of its ſubſtance or origin. However, he thinks them upon the whole wiſer and more orthodox than the *Hypnologiſts*, who boaſt that they are diſciples of Chriſt, *Fol.* I. v.

He

He ſays likewiſe in one of his prefaces, " that " they who hold the opinion he endeavours to " confute, pay no regard to the ſcriptures;" even while he is labouring and ſweating to ſet aſide the force of a great number of texts they bring from thence.

Among other things, he takes notice of an objection to his ſyſtem, drawn from the ſilence of the ſcriptures touching any rewards and puniſhments but thoſe of a final judgment.

He acknowledges the fact, but will not allow of the conſequence. " I anſwer, ſays he, that " Chriſt is our head, whoſe kingdom and glory " have not yet appeared. If the members were " to go before the head, the order of things " would be perverted and prepoſterous. But we ſhall then follow our prince, when he ſhall " come in the glory of his Father, and ſit " upon the throne of his majeſty. *In the mean* " *time*, THAT *liveth*, which is in us, of, or " from God, namely our ſpirit, becauſe Chriſt " *liveth* who is our *life*; for it would be abſurd " that we ſhould *periſh*, while our *life liveth*. " And becauſe our *life* is *in* God, it is therefore " *with* God and happy *(y)*.

It would be doing too much honour to this contemptible ſtring of quibbles to offer a replication. We therefore bid *John Calvin* good night, obſerving only that one might bring his own commentaries, compoſed in his riper years,

(y) Pſychopan, fol. 35.

to confront the fooliſh interpretations of many ſcriptures cited in the *Pſychopannychia*.

VI.

1530-36. In no long time the doctrine of the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul began to creep into the public Confeſſions of divers proteſtant churches, and conſequently to be equally ſacred among the reformed, as the canons of *Clement* and *Leo* had made it among the papiſts.

Hitherto indeed no formal confeſſion of the proteſtant faith had publicly appeared, except thoſe preſented to the Emperor, *Charles* V. at the Diet of *Augſburgh*, 1530, one by the Elector of *Saxony and the Princes his* adherents, known by the name of the confeſſion of *Augſburgh*; and another by the free cities of *Straſburgh*, *Conſtance*, *Memmingen*, and *Lindau*.

The latter has nothing concerning the immortality of the ſoul, nor any thing tending to diſcover the ſentiments of the ſubſcribers, on that ſubject.

The other, which was drawn up by *Melancthon*, touches upon it very lightly, in the article concerning the invocation of ſaints, upon the pretence that the writers among the *Lutherans* had been very full on the ſubject. This want of preciſion begat conferences between the papiſts and proteſtants, wherein the latter are ſaid to have allowed, "that ſaints and angels inter-
"cede for us, and were therefore to be ho-
"noured

" noured but not invoked *(z)*." This and other conceſſions, mentioned during this Diet, are put to the account of *Melancthon*'s timidity: Whether he ever made ſuch a conceſſion is yet a problem *(a)*, nor does ſuch allowance ſeem to be very conſiſtent with the argument in the *Confeſſion*, *viz.* " that invocation of ſaints at-
" tributes omnipotence to the dead, and implies
" that the ſaints know the motions of men's
" hearts *(b)*." Be that as it might, this doctrine of *interceſſion*, under certain limitations, was afterwards admitted by ſome of the *Lutherans*, as we ſhall preſently ſee.

The firſt *Helvetic* confeſſion, exhibited by *Bucer* and *Capito* at the convention of Divines at *Wittembergh*, in the year 1536, and afterwards by *Bucer* alone at *Smalcald* 1537, makes no mention of the ſeparate ſoul, or caring for the dead. This confeſſion, and that of the four free cities abovementioned, were probably both drawn up by *Bucer*.

In the year 1551, Confeſſions were prepared to be exhibited to the Council of *Trent* by divers proteſtant ſtates and churches, among others, by the Duke of *Wirtenbergh*, and by the churches of *Saxony*. 1551.

" We acknowledge, ſay the *Wirtenberghers*,
" that the ſaints in heaven pray for us before
" God, *ſuo quodam modo*." In the next chapter
" they ſay, " Faith requires that we ſhould think

(z) *Maimbourg* Hiſt. *Luth.* apud *Seckendorf* l. ii. pag. 178
(a) Vid. *Seckendorf* l. iii. p. 548.
(b) *Corpus Confeſs.* p. 28. partis 2dæ.

" that

" that the dead are not nothing, but that they " truly live before God; the pious happily in " Chriſt; the wicked in an horrible expectation " of the revelation of divine judgment *(c)*." Wreſting thus what the Apoſtle *Heb.* x. 27, ſays of apoſtates in this world, to the *intermediate* ſtate of the impious dead; as indeed *Calvin* had done before them *(d)*.

The *Saxons* ſay, " In this faith [*viz.* of the " three creeds] we invocate the true God, who " manifeſted himſelf to his church by ſending " his ſon, and adding other illuſtrious teſti- " monies, *joyning our prayers with all ſaints* " *in heaven and earth*." In another place however they affirm, " that the ſaints are *dead* and " cannot hear the prayers of their votaries *(e)*," and how in that caſe they can *joyn* with them in prayer, is a little incomprehenſible.

However when the *Harmonizers* of the Protetant confeſſions, under the auſpices of the *Belgic* and *Gallican* churches, undertook in the year 1581, to make all things ſmooth and conſiſtent, they found themſelves under a neceſſity of applying a corrective to theſe doctrines of the *Saxons* and *Wirtenberghers*, as follows.

(c) Harmon. Conf. p. 14. 1mæ partis.

(d) Ubi oculi mentis noſtræ, qui nunc ſepulti in carne, hebetes ſunt, abſterſerint hanc velut lippitudinem, videbimus quæ expectabamus, et ea requie delectabimur. Neque enim veremur id poſt Apoſtolum dicere, qui è converſo dicit φθαρεαν την εικονην χριστου manere reprobos. Si hæc terribilis, illa ſane et læta, et beata merito vocabitur. *Pſychopan*, 35. f. v.

(e) Corpus Conf. p. 72, & 125. 2dæ partis.

" *Joyning*

" *Joyning our prayer*] We learn in many " places of the holy ſcripture, that the angels, " according to the nature of the miniſtry which " they are ſent to perform, do further the " ſalvation of the godly, and it is evident from " that ſaying, *Love doth not fall away*, and by " *Apoc.* vi. 10, that the ſpirits of the ſaints taken " up unto Chriſt, do with *their holy deſires*, IN " SOME SORT, help forward the grace and " goodneſs of God, touching the full deliver- " ance of the church. And we judge that " as well this, and other places as of the ſame " confeſſion, and alſo that place in the 23d " chap. of the confeſſion of *Wirtenbergh*, which " followeth after the 2d ſection, p. 45 [p. 48 " of the latin] are ſo to be interpreted. And " we acknowledge NO OTHER interceſſion or " intreating either of the bleſſed angels, or of " the ſpirits of holy men, that are now de- " parted from us *(f)*."

Probè feciſtis, incertior ſum multo quam dudum.

When people ſay the ſaints pray for them, intercede for them, and that they are better for ſuch interceſſion, though I know they are miſtaken, I know at leaſt what they mean. But when I am told, " that, (not the *prayers*, but) " the *deſires* of the ſaints, do, *in ſome ſort* help " forward the grace and goodneſs of God, in " the full deliverance of the church," I am bewildered in a miſt of words, to which I can fix no ideas.

(*f*) See the *Obſervations* at the end of the *Harmony* of Confeſſions. *Obſ.* 1. upon the *Saxon* confeſſion.

The

The editors of the *Corpus Confeſſionum*, made ſhorter work with the *Saxon*'s ſtill, by exhibiting their confeſſion without the clauſe, *conjunctâ precatione noſtra*. I was going to ſay, *fairly*, till I caſt my eye by chance on the firſt words of the preface to this collection, viz. *Exhibentur in hoc volumine, celeberrimæ confeſſiones fidei, ex optimis quibuſque editionibus*, EX OMNI PARTE INTEGRÆ.

For my part, I cannot help commiſerating the diſtreſs of theſe poor men, who having once allowed the Saints a conſcious exiſtence in heaven, were ſo hard put to it to keep clear of the conſequences.

VII.

1552. There was however as yet nothing in any of theſe confeſſions, which formally condemned the doctrine of *the ſleep of the ſoul*, as an *hereſy*. The *Lutherans*, as appears by the particulars above recited, halted between two opinions. Whatever *Luther*'s private ſentiments were, he had no where decided dogmatically on the ſubject; and the difference between his followers, and thoſe of *Zuinglius* concerning the ſacrament, ſo wholly engroſſed the attention of both parties, that other matters were much overlooked.

The honour of firſt condemning this tenet was reſerved for our Engliſh Reformers, who in the 40th of King *Edward*'s articles compoſed in the year 1552, and publiſhed the year following, expreſſed themſelves thus.

" They

" They who ſay that the ſouls of ſuch as " depart hence do ſleep, being without all " ſenſe, feeling, and perceiving, until the day " of judgment, or affirm that the ſouls die " with the bodies, and at the laſt day ſhall be " raiſed up with the ſame, do utterly diſſent " from the right belief declared unto us in the " holy ſcripture."

Biſhop *Burnet*, ſpeaking of theſe articles, ſays, " Thus was the doctrine of the church " caſt into a *ſhort* and *plain* form, in which they " took care both to eſtabliſh the poſitive arti- " cles of religion, and to cut off the errors for- " merly introduced in the time of popery, or " of late broached by the Anabaptiſts and En- " thuſiaſts of *Germany*; avoiding the niceties " of ſchoolmen, and the peremptorineſs of " the writers of controverſy *(g)*."

One may be pretty ſure that this article was not aimed at any error of popery; and what buſineſs had our reformers to condemn the Enthuſiaſts of *Germany*, in a point of doctrine which had not been cenſured publicly by the orthodox of their own country? It is probable the doctrine here condemned had been held and propagated by ſome of our own people at home.

" There were, ſays *Strype*, a looſer ſort of pro- " feſſors of religion, *a ſort of Anabaptiſts*, who, " a little before that time, had private meetings, " wherein they propoſed *odd queſtions*, and vented

(g) *Burnet*'s Hiſt. Ref. vol. ii. p. 168.

" dangerous doctrines and opinions. Of theſe " the council having notice, they thought it very " fit to diſcountenance and reſtrain them *(h)*."

The truth is, whoever in thoſe days entertained any opinion out of the common road, was called an *Anabaptiſt*, though perhaps he did not know what were the diſtinguiſhing doctrines of that ſect. Juſt as in theſe latter times they who have been troubleſome to the profeſſors of the orthodox ſyſtem, have been claſped with *Arians*, *Socinians*, *Methodiſts*, &c.

1562. But whatever was the motive with King *Edward*'s reformers to declare againſt the ſleep of the ſoul in this peremptory manner, when the articles came to be reviewed in 1562, by *Parker* and his aſſociates, this 40th article was droped; in conſideration, as it ſhould ſeem, that by allowing *ſeparate* ſouls to have ſenſe, feeling, and perception, the doctrines of purgatory and invocation would very naturally follow. It is for their honour too, to ſuppoſe they had looked into the ſcriptures with a little more care and ſagacity than their predeceſſors, and could not find the *right belief* mentioned in the article.

VIII.

1566. In the year 1566, was publiſhed the ſecond *Helvetic* confeſſion, fabricated entirely upon the the Calviniſtical plan. *Luther* had now been long out of the way, and the reign of *Calvin*

(*h*) Life of *Cranmer*, p. 233.

at

at *Geneva* had determined by his death, but two years before. *Beza* ſucceeded him, and moſt probably drew up this confeſſion, of which the following is part of the ſeventh article, intituled, *Of the creation of all things, of angels, the devil, and man.*

" We hold that man conſiſts of two, and " thoſe different ſubſtances in one perſon; of " an immortal ſoul, ſeeing that, being ſepa- " rated from the body, it neither ſleeps nor " dies; and of a mortal body, which yet, at " the laſt judgment, ſhall be raiſed from the " dead, that the whole man from thenceforward, may remain to eternity, either in life " or death. We condemn all who ſcoff at the " immortality of the ſoul, or bring it into doubt " by ſubtle diſputations, or who ſay that the " ſoul ſleeps, or that it is a part of God *(i)*."

Who ſees not in this *proteſtant* canon, the features of that of the *Lateran* council?

1. Mr. *Bayle*, apologizing for *Pomponatius*, has the following remark. " In *Pomponatius*'s " time they knew of no philoſophical ſyſtem " but that of *Ariſtotle*, ſo that to aſſert that " the immortality of the ſoul could not be " proved by the principles of that philoſopher, " and to aſſert that it could not be proved by " philoſophical reaſons, was one and the ſame thing *(k)*."

What *Bayle* ſays of the time of *Pomponatius*, is equally true of the time of *Calvin* and *Beza*.

(i) Corp. Confeſs. p. 25. 1mæ partis.
(k) *Bayle*, POMPONACE Rem.

The doctrine of the two ſubſtances in man, is founded upon the philoſophy of *Ariſtotle*, in the *Helvetic*, as well as *in* the *Roman* Bull. *Calvin* was as deep in *ſubſtantial forms*, as *Clement* or *Leo:* and, as it might be made appear by his account of election, reprobation, grace, *&c.* had as much occaſion for them.

2. The *Helvetic* heroes as well as the *pontifician*, are for prohibiting all diſputes upon the queſtion concerning the immortality of the ſoul, and both under the ſame anathema. *Damnamus et reprobamus*, &c

3. The *Helvetians* ſay, "We condemn all "who aſſert that the ſoul is *a part of God.*" CALVIN, if I miſtake not, aſſerted ſomething very like it, in a paſſage cited above out of *Pſychopannychia*. He calls the ſoul, *id quod in nobis ex Deo eſt*. If by *ex Deo*, he meant only *from God*, the ſame may be ſaid of every ingredient in our compoſition. But his expreſſion ſhews that he meant to diſtinguiſh the ſoul from ſomething elſe which was not *ex Deo*, in the ſame ſenſe at leaſt. How this diſtinction can be explained without conſidering the ſoul, as *diſcerptum quiddam ex Deo*, I ſee not.

In the twenty-ſixth article of the ſame confeſſion, we meet with the following paſſage.

"We believe that the faithful migrate di-
"rectly from their corporeal death to Chriſt,
"and therefore do not want the prayers, litur-
"gies, or liturgic offices of the living for the
"dead. Alſo we believe that the wicked are
"directly precipitated into Hell, from whence
"there

" there is no *outlet* for impious perſons, to be " procured by any offices of the living."

If this is really the caſe, not only liturgic offices, but even a reſurrection, and a future judgment, are needleſs things. Be it remarked that this is the firſt time we meet with the *Florentine* doctrine, of *immediate migration* to Chriſt (noted as a deviation from the primitive creed by Bp. *Taylor*, as above) publickly avowed by a proteſtant church. However, ſo little careful were theſe Helvetians of expreſſing themſelves accurately and conſiſtently, that in another place of this very confeſſion, the ſouls or ſpirits of the ſaints get no higher than the ſtars. *Poſtquam aſtra petiiſſet ſpiritus.* Art. V.

IX.

Theſe laſt particulars remind me of our neighbours the Scots, whom I was in ſome danger of paſſing by. In the year 1560, their confeſſion was offered in, and ratified by the Parliament at *Edinburgh*, Auguſt 17 *(l)*, of which here followeth the ſeventeenth Article. 1568. 1580.

" The elect departed are in peace, and reſt " from their labours: not that they ſlepe and " come to a certain oblivion, as ſome fantaſtiks " do affirme: but that they are delivered " from all fear and torment, and all temptation to which we and all God's elect are " ſubject in this life, and therefore do bear the

(*l*) See *Spotſwood*'s Hiſt. of the church of *Scotland*, B. iii. p. 150. Ed. 1677. where are ſome circumſtances much to the honour of our reforming neighbours.

" name

" name of the church militant: as contrari-
" wiſe, the reprobate and unfaithful departed
" have anguiſh and paine that cannot be ex-
" preſſed. So that neither are the one nor the
" other in ſuch ſlepe that they fele not their tor-
" ment [l. condition.]" * for which they quote. *Luke* xvi. 22, 23. xxiii. 43. *Apoc.* vi. 9.

I am

(*) I tranſcribe this from a copy of the Scottiſh confeſſion, printed at *London*, by *Rouland Hall*, 1561, ſaid to be ſet forth and authorized according to the Quenes Majeſties injunctions. [*Elizabeth.*] It is exactly the ſame which is at the end of the Engliſh tranſlation of the *Harmony of Confeſſions*, of which I have two editions, and all three agree in ſaying that, " neither the one nor the other feel their *tor-*
" *ment.*" But the latin in the *Corpus Confeſſionum*, has it, *Ut neque hi neque illi, adeo dormiunt, quin ſentiunt in qua* conditione *verſentur.* And we are there informed, that this latin tranſlation was made by a Scotch nobleman of great piety, who, in a ſhort preface, ſpeaks of this confeſſion, " as *firſt publiſhed* in the year 1568, and being only in the " Scottiſh dialect, had not been communicated, that he " knew of, to any other churches." Which is the more probable, as it had been in print ſeven or eight years before the Tranſlator himſelf knew of it. *James* VI. cauſed it to be ſolemnly ſubſcribed and ratified in Parliament, anno 1580. *Spotſwood* ſays that " the King, having had certain diſpenſa-
" tions ſhewed to him which came from *Rome*, whereby the
" catholicks were permitted to promiſe, ſwear, ſubſcribe,
" &c. any thing, ſo as in mind they continued firm, and
" did uſe their diligence to advance in ſecret the Roman
" faith, cauſed his miniſter Mr. *John Craig*, form a ſhort
" confeſſion of faith, wherein all the corruptions of *Rome*,
" as well in doctrine, as outward rites, were particularly
" abjured, and a clauſe inſerted (becauſe of theſe diſpenſa-
" tions) by which the ſubſcribers did call God to witneſs,
" that in their minds and hearts they did fully agree to the
" ſaid confeſſion, and not feign or diſſemble in any ſort."
This is only a formal proteſtation againſt the errors of popery, which now appears at the head of the old confeſſion.

James

I am afraid this article will by no means *harmonize* with the Helvetic migration of holy ſouls to Chriſt, nor with *direct precipitation* of the wicked and unbelievers into hell. The happineſs of the ſaints here mentioned, is all of the negative ſort, and though poſitive torments and anguiſh are, in this Scottiſh confeſſion, made the portion of the wicked, yet we find it all ends in this, that neither the one nor the other are ſo faſt aſleep, but that they are ſenſible of their condition. The hypotheſis of the *Scots* ſeems to admit of an increaſe of happineſs and miſery after the reſurrection; that of the *Helvetians* will admit of none.

X.

Accordingly when, in the year 1612 the confeſſion of the *Remonſtrants* appeared, the *Calviniſts* cenſured it, among other things, for omitting to mention, the happy immortality of ſouls in heaven, after this life, which, they ſay, is expreſsly delivered in their catechiſm; and for this omiſſion, the Remonſtrants are accuſed of *Socinianiſm (m)*. 1612.

James was then but in the 14th year of his age. But as he led the way with his own ſubſcription both to the *Proteſtation* and *Confeſſion*, occaſion was taken from hence by *Bellarmine*, after *James*'s acceſſion to the crown of *England*, to reproach him as having eſpouſed and authenticated the doctrine of the *Puritans*: which laid biſhop *Andrews* under the diſagreeable dilemma either of acknowledging the orthodoxy of the Scottiſh confeſſion, or of pleading the king's nonage againſt his own royal act. *Vid. Reſponſ. ad Apolog. Card. Bellarmini.* 4to 1610. p. 352.

(m) Apologia pro Confeſſione Remonſtrantium. cap. xix.

Epiſcopius

Epiſcopius defends himſelf and his brethren by obſerving, " that the judgments of the " greateſt divines had formerly, and ſtill did " vary, concerning the ſtate of departed ſouls; " that the fathers ſeemed to be pretty well " agreed, that no ſouls were admitted into pa- " radiſe, till our Saviour by his death, opened " the door and went in, with the penitent thief " in his company: that though all the fathers, " down to the end of the fourth century, " judged that the ſouls of the faithful were re- " ceived into Paradiſe after our Lord had opened " it, yet they were far from agreeing what or " where this Paradiſe was. Some underſtood " that it meant *heaven*, others *Hades*, not the " place of torment, but a common receptacle " where the ſouls of the good and bad were " reſerved till the laſt judgment, for which he " cites *Lactantius* lib. vii. cap. 21.——The " Greek fathers, he ſays, were unanimous in " their opinion that the ſouls of the ſaints did " not enjoy the viſion of God, nor were ad- " mitted into the fruition of glory, till the re- " ſurrection; and that *Calvin* himſelf ſeems to " have favoured this notion, both in his *Pſy-* " *chopannychia* and in his inſtitutions *, and " laſtly,

* *Ludovicus Capellus* publiſhed a tract intituled, *De hominum poſt mortem ſtatu uſq; ad ultimum judicii diem*, wherein he attempts to prove, againſt the received opinion, " that " the ſeparate ſoul doth not go immediately to heaven or " hell upon the death of the body, but remains in a ſtate of " expectation, which is a ſtate of happineſs or miſery, ac- " cording

" laſtly that the *Socinians* themſelves acknow-
" ledge as much concerning the reception of
" ſouls into heaven immediately after their de-
" parture from the body, as is expreſſed in the
" general words of their catechiſm, *&c.* *(n)*.

The *Calviniſts*, I believe, muſt have been grievouſly provoked and mortified by this reply of *Epiſcopius*, the truth of which they could not deny. To ſhew that they went againſt the ſtream of the moſt orthodox fathers in their *catechiſm*, was bad enough. But that was a ſmall matter in compariſon of his putting it out of their power to fix *Socinianiſm* on the *Remonſtrants*, without ſtigmatizing their venerable maſter with the ſame brand-mark.

The reader will not expect that I who profeſs to conſult his eaſe as well as my own, ſhould take notice of a thouſandth part of the various ſcribblings on the immortality of the ſoul, with which, every ſubdiviſion of the period we have gone through, was peſtered, by papiſts, and proteſtants, by men of all ſects and

" cording as the ſoul is conſcious of the good or evil of its
" by-ſpent life, during its union with the body." *See* a collection of his pieces in folio printed at *Amſterdam* 1689. In this tract *Capellus* cites theſe paſſages of *Calvin*, mentioned by *Epiſcopius*, as agreeing with his opinion, but is obliged to add ſuch comments and explanations to *Calvin*'s words as plainly ſhew the ſentiments of that Reformer to have been by no means clear and preciſe upon the ſubject. *Calvin* indeed was far from being maſter of the queſtion; and one may diſcover in his expreſſions a kind of perplexity which was plainly ſuggeſted by the fear of giving advantages to his adverſaries of different denominations.

(n) Apol. pro Confeſ. Remonſt. II. 5.

 hereſies,

hereſies, and even by Jews and Mahometans. It is but good manners to ſuppoſe that they who preſided in chriſtian churches, and to whom the formation of public ſyſtems of doctrine was left, would ſelect the *quinteſſence* of all the learning that had ever been employed in elucidating any particular ſubject. 'Tis our misfortune that they ſeem to have ſucceeded worſe on the queſtion before us than upon any other. I mean this of our proteſtant anceſtors. For to what do all their determinations amount, but to a confuſed jumble of inconſiſtent notions concerning an intermediate ſtate, which while one ſett are labouring to prop by ſcripture hints and innuendos, in conſequence of the old ſyſtem of natural immortality, another are endeavouring to pull down in order to keep out *purgatory*, by proving that the ſcriptures ſpeak of *two* ſtates *only*, heaven and hell.

It may probably be neither unentertaining nor unedifying to ſubjoyn the account that *Capellus* gives of the original of this diſtreſs.

" Some, ſays he, perhaps may wonder, how " it has happened, if our opinion is the more " probable, that both Proteſtant and Popiſh " Divines have agreed in that opinion which we oppoſe (*viz.* that the ſouls of good men go " immediately to heaven) I anſwer, that both " the one and the other have departed from " the primitive opinion of the ancient fathers " of the Chriſtian Church, and eſpouſed this " other, but with very different and contrary " views. The Papiſts, in order to ſupport their

" erroneous

" erroneous practice of invocating the ſaints, " thought it convenient, that the ſaints ſhould " be ſtationed, before the reſurrection, in the " third heaven, where the bleſſed enjoy the " beatific viſion of God, and where, in their " fictitious mirrour of the Divine Eſſence, they " might behold all things which are tranſacted " upon earth: and that being by this means " nearer, and conſequently more like unto " God, they might ſeem to be properer objects " of our prayers, vows and religious worſhip. " It was therefore the ſpirit of ſuperſtition and " idolatry, which drove the Papiſts into this " opinion. But the Proteſtants, having another " popiſh error to oppoſe, namely Purgatory, " and the proper ſatisfaction for ſin there to be " made, which would have authorized the " Pope's indulgences; were afraid that, if " they ſhould grant that there was a *third* " place appointed for the ſouls of the pious and " holy after this mortal life, they might like- " wiſe be obliged to admit this fictitious Purga- " tory. And therefore thought it ſafer abſo- " lutely to deny any middle ſtate, than to ex- " poſe themſelves to the tricks and ſubtilties " of the Papiſts in ſupporting their Purgatory, " by granting ſuch third or middle ſtate *."

What *Capellus* propoſed by this diſſertation was to help his brethren the Proteſtants, out of this difficulty, which he thought might be done by ſhewing " that a purgatory would not follow

* From the tract abovementioned, at the end.

" from the conceſſion of a middle ſtate ſuch as " the primitive fathers had repreſented it." In this he ſuccedes well enough. But he had done much better ſervice to the Proteſtant cauſe, and gained more honour to himſelf, had he ſhewn, as he might have done by the help of thoſe very texts he employs, that there were no grounds for the notion of an intermediate conſciouſneſs of ſeparate ſouls, either of the righteous or the wicked, between death and the reſurrection. But by incumbring himſelf with this intermediate conſciouſneſs without determining where or how the ſeparate ſoul ſubſiſts, he has left the diſpute juſt where he found it; and to confeſs the truth, has made ſtrange work with ſome of thoſe texts, which, in their plain, obvious meaning, neither favoured him nor his adverſaries.

For example. Speaking to that text of St. *Paul* 1 Cor. xv. 18. where the apoſtle ſays, *If Chriſt is not riſen, then they who are fallen aſleep in Chriſt are periſhed*, he comments upon it thus, *Pereunt, non quidem quoad lò eſſe, ſed quoad lò bene eſſe; hoc eſt, quantum ad felicitatem* [*poſitam in lætâ beatæ reſurrectionis futuræ exſpectatione*, as he deſcribes this felicity above] *quæ ſic prorſus evertitur, ſublatâ reſurrectione.* What idea can any one form of theſe *half-periſhed* ſouls? But what will not an eagerneſs to ſerve an hypotheſis tempt a man to ſay?

XI.

1628. But as the Papiſts were ſteady to their intereſt, and, for the moſt part, uniform in the ſupport of

of a point upon which ſo much of it depended, they had a great advantage againſt the Proteſtants who were divided, not only upon this, but upon other ſubjects.

Among others who attacked them upon the ſcore of their diviſions, was a capuchin friar, called *Valerian Magni* who in the year 1628 publiſhed a book at *Prague*, intituled, *De Acatholicorum regula credendi (p)*.

This book was anſwered by *Joachim Stegman* a Socinian divine, in a tract intituled, *Brevis Diſquiſitio, an et quomodo vulgo dicti evangelici pontificios, ac nominatim* Valeriani Magni *de Acatholicorum credendi regulâ judicium ſolide atque evidenter refutare queant (q)*.

The ſcope of *Stegman*'s work is to ſhew, that the Proteſtants, by adhering to the peculiar ſyſtem of *Luther*, *Brentius*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, &c. &c. had, in many inſtances, offered weak and improper arguments againſt Popery, which had laid them under needleſs difficulties. His advice is therefore to diſcard all human authority, and ſtick to the ſcripture only, as explained and underſtood by right reaſon, without having any regard to tradition, or the authority of Fathers, Councils, &c.

Mr. *Bayle* ſays this book did more hurt than good, not becauſe it was not well written, but becauſe it tended to diſparage the reputation of

(p) *Bayle*'s Dict. Vol. 5th, p. 741. Edit. 1738. and *Deſmaizeaux* Life of *Hales*, p. 4, 5.

(q) There is an Engliſh tranſlation of this book in the *Phœnix*, vol. 2.

the

the firſt Reformers, broke in upon their ſeveral ſyſtems, and what was worſe than all the reſt, was manifeſtly the work of ſomebody tainted with the hereſies of *Socinus* and *Arminius (r)*.

In the eighth chapter of this tract the author obſerves, " that *Luther* and *Calvin* teach ſuch " things, as are injuriouſly defended, not only " againſt the Papiſts, but alſo againſt the very " life of the Chriſtian religion, true piety. Of " the former ſort is that opinion wherein they " hold that the dead live. For they ſuppoſe that " the ſouls of men, in that very moment where- " in they are parted from their bodies by death,

(r) For a ſample of the opinions of the orthodox concerning this book, take the following account of it in a letter from Dr. *Samuel Ward* to Archbiſhop *Uſher*. " There is a " little book, intituled *Brevis Diſquiſitio*, which, I ſuppoſe, " your Lordſhip hath ſeen. It containeth in it ſundry, " both *Socinian* and *Pelagian* points; as alſo that the body " which ſhall be raiſed in the reſurrection, is not *idem nu-* " *mero*; alſo ſouls do not live till the reſurrection, beſides " ſundry other points. It is printed *Eleutheropoli*. It is " ſaid it cometh out of *Eaton*-College and that *Aleſius* [*John* " *Hales*] ſhould be the author, who was at *Dort* with us. " I am ſorry ſuch a book ſhould come thence." *Parr*'s Life of *Uſher*, p. 473.---Such is the illiberal voice of eſtabliſhed ſyſtem. Could more ſeaſonable or wholeſome advice be given to Proteſtants? Was not this the very method afterwards adopted by our incomparable *Chillingworth?* Did not the Papiſts feel the effects of it from his able hand with the utmoſt regret. " It is a *new ſhift*, ſays the abſurd *Creſſy*, " which, how far other Proteſtants out of *England* will ap- " prove, I know not." Whether they approved it or not is very immaterial. Whatever may become of *their* methods, *Chillingworth*'s method will remain an impregnable bulwark, not only againſt that wicked and ſordid ſuperſtition, but againſt all attempts to overthrow *Chriſtian Liberty*, from any other quarter; as long as his book ſhall laſt.

are

" are carried either to heaven, and do there feel " heavenly joy, and poſſeſs all kinds of happi- " neſs which God hath promiſed to his people; " or to hell, and are there tormented and ex- " cruciated with unquenchable fire. And this " they attribute to the mere ſouls ſeparated from " the bodies, even before the reſurrection of the " men themſelves, that is to ſay, while they are " yet dead.—Now this is the foundation, not " only of Purgatory, but alſo of that horrible " idolatry practiſed among the Papiſts, while " they invocate the ſaints that are dead (*s*)."

Stegman, whatever inferences he might draw from *Calvin*'s principles, certainly miſrepreſents *Luther*, as will be ſeen in the *Appendix*. He is however quite right in ſaying that if the ſyſtem above recited is admitted, you cannot eaſily overthrow the invocation of Saints.

Cardinal *du Perron*, for example, argues thus. " It is certain that the devils themſelves " know all things that paſs in our imagination, " as all theſe things are thoughts. For the " maxim of *St. Auſtin*, is indubitable, *oportet* " *intelligentem ſpeculari phantaſmata* (*t*): which " being ſo, there is no room to doubt, but that " angels and happy ſpirits, clearly underſtand " and know the prayers, even the mental ones,

(*s*) *Phœnix* vol. ii. p. 334. Not having the original latin, I am obliged to make uſe of the bad tranſlation in this collection. The *Diſquiſitio* is here aſcribed to *Hales* of *Eton*: concerning which miſtake. See *Deſmaizeaux*, Hiſt. & Crit. Account of his Life, p. 4. &c.

(*t*) *Auſtin* had the maxim from *Ariſtotle*. Vid. Pomponat. Chap. iii. Νοουντα δει φαντασματα θεωρειν.

" of

" of thoſe who call upon them.---If the dæ-
" mons hear the prayers of thoſe who call them
" up, how is it that the ſaints are believed to
" be deaf to the prayers of thoſe who invoke
" them? *(u)*."

Againſt this reaſoning it would be in vain to argue, as the Proteſtants did in their confeſſions, and elſewhere, " that if the Saints heard " the prayers of their votaries, they muſt be " omnipotent." There was not a Proteſtant among them, that, in thoſe days, would venture to deny the indubitable maxim of St. *Auſtin*, and having once placed the ſaints in heaven, nothing would diſparage them ſo much as ſuppoſe they had not as much ſpiritual intelligence as the Devils.

But what do we talk of *thoſe days?* A divine of our own times, of no ſmall reputation, has not only granted the premiſſes, but left as much room for the conſequences, as the Papiſts themſelves could deſire. " He ſays, that ſeparate " ſpirits become conſcious of one another's " thoughts and volitions by ſome unknown " way that God has appointed,---and that " doubtleſs, there is a way, which God, the " creator ſpirit, has ordained, whereby created " ſpirits, which are ſocial beings, ſhall main- " tain ſociety and friendly communion with " other created ſpirits, when they are in their " native ſtate, ſeparate from their material en-

(u) PERRONIANA au motte DIABLES.

" gines."

" gines. *(w)*." And then if to this we add another of his poſitions, " that the ſoul acts " ſeparately from the body, even whilſt the " body is alive," it may as certainly have communication with its kindred diſembodied ſpirits, and in the ſame unknown way, as thoſe diſembodied ſpirits have communication and ſociety one with another; and this being admitted, what is there to hinder Cardinal *Perron*'s concluſion from taking immediate effect? Or what occaſion to aſcribe omnipotence and omniſcience to this ſpiritual ſociety, ſeeing the creator ſpirit confers upon them knowledge and capacity enough, in Dr. *Watts*'s way, to qualify them for interceſſors, and to keep open the communication, by a chain of intelligence from embodied ſpirits to diſembodied, from thoſe to angels, &c.

XII.

Dr. *Watts*'s theory is that of *Des Cartes*, which he adopts in order to confute Mr. *Locke*'s principle that the ſoul does not always think. And as the French philoſopher comes next under our notice in order of time, we ſhall now take a ſhort view of his operations and ſucceſs. 1640.

Des Cartes's aim was to confute the doctrine of *ſubſtantial forms*, which imported, " that " natural bodies are made up of two ſubſtan-

(w) Watts's Philoſophical Eſſays, 8vo. 1733. p. 176.

" ces, matter, and form. That the form of " all natural bodies, man only excepted, is a " corruptible being, which never fails to be " deſtroyed when the compound periſhes, that " is whenever a ſtone, or a tree, or a dog " are converted into natural bodies of another " ſpecies. *(x)*."

To ſhew how man came to be excepted out of this general law of nature, was the buſineſs of the ſchoolmen, who however did not give univerſal ſatisfaction to ſome philoſophers prior to *Des Cartes*. It was obſerved, that they who followed this ſyſtem, could give no proofs of the immortality of the ſoul; for in order to that, they ſhould make it appear that the ſoul is immaterial; which the very notion of its being the ſubſtantial or eſſential form of a material body, would not admit of.

The ſcholaſtic hypotheſis indeed, was thus effectually overthrown, but the church could not ſpare the doctrine of the immortality of the ſoul, or its conſcious exiſtence in a ſeparate ſtate, and they who had ſenſe enough to demoliſh the hypotheſis of *Ariſtotle* and *Aquinas*, never attempted to find out another that would anſwer the ſame purpoſe.

This honour was reſerved for *Des Cartes*, whoſe *meditations* appeared in the year 1640. The ſum of his ſyſtem is, " that all thinking " ſubſtances are diſtinct from matter, from " whence it neceſſarily follows, that the ſoul

(x) Bayle POMPONATIUS. [F.]

" of

" of man is a ſpirit, or a ſimple indiviſible be-
" ing, and conſequently immortal." Hence it followed that a ſubſtantial form, being co-extended with the body to which it belonged, and conſequently *diviſible*, muſt be incapable of thinking.

This doctrine of *Des Cartes* was immediately controverted by the great *Gaſſendi*, who maintained, that " though it ſhould be granted, that mind and body may be conceived apart, it would not follow that they are two diſtinct ſubſtances, and he ſays, *Des Cartes* neither has proved, nor can prove from reaſon, (for he grants the fact in compliment to the church) that thought and extenſion may not go together, conſtituting one being or *compoſitum*, and that all *Des Cartes*'s pretended demonſtrations, are mere affirmations, and *petitiones principii*. He derides the notion of an unextended ſubſtance, receiving extended images, and being itſelf ſpread through, commixed, or united with the body, acting on, and feeling from each part, and being either *totum in toto* or *totum in qualibet parte*, &c. &c. *(y)*."

It was to little purpoſe that *Gaſſendi* paid this compliment to the church, namely, to grant the exiſtence of the ſoul in a ſeparate ſtate, if, as Mr. *Arnauld* affirmed, the reading of *Gaſſendi*'s book led ſome perſons at *Naples* into the error of *Epicurus*, concerning the mortality of

(y) Gaſſend. opuſc. philoſoph. Tom. iii.

the ſoul. And as *Arnauld* himſelf was a zealous *Carteſian*, no doubt but he was perſuaded that *Gaſſendi*'s reaſoning had this impious tendency.

The church however to which theſe gentlemen belonged, thought very differently from Mr. *Arnauld*. The inquiſitors of Rome put *Des Cartes*'s book into their *Index expurgatorius*, but did not at all concern themſelves with that of *Gaſſendi*; which provoked *Arnauld* to exclaim, "Is not this to permit men to ſwallow poiſon, and prohibit them from taking the antidote? *(z)*."

"No, would the Inquiſitors have replied, you quite miſtake the matter. The poiſon is in the book of *Des Cartes*. His demonſtrations have a tendency to ſet aſide the moſt ſolemn deciſions of the church *(a)*. An immaterial ſubſtance can ſuffer nothing in *our* purgatory. We deſire to ſtick to *ſubſtantial forms*. And we give you fair warning, that whatever philoſophical ſyſtem moſt favours the peculiar doctrines of the church, will always have the greateſt merit with us, whatever reaſon, truth, or good ſenſe there may be in that which oppoſes it."----Was not Mr. *Arnauld*

(z) Bayle. PONPONATIUS, rem. [G.]

(a) Des Cartes's principles were demonſtrated to be contrary to the doctrine of the church of *Rome* in the article of Tranſubſtantiation, in a book publiſhed at *Paris*, 1680. See Mr. *Bayle*'s Letters. Let. xxxi. Edit. *Amſterdam* 1729. See alſo *Journal des Scavans* for *February*, 1666. pag. 250. *Amſterdam*, 1679.

aware

aware of this? Or did he diſſemble his knowledge of it?

Mr. *Arnauld* ſuppoſes that if *Gaſſendi* and others would not have oppoſed *Des Cartes*'s ſyſtem, but have left it to it's natural operation, it might have been of infinite ſervice in convincing the moſt incredulous, that nothing can be more contrary to reaſon than to aſſert that the ſoul periſhes with the body. "This, *Arnauld* ſays, *Des Cartes* made appear by laying down from clear principles, and ſuch as are only grounded on natural notions, which men of ſenſe cannot but acknowledge, that the ſoul and the body, that is, what thinks, and what is extended, are two ſubſtances wholly diſtinct; ſo that it is impoſſible that extenſion ſhould be the mode of a thinking ſubſtance, and thought the mode of an extended one. This being well proved, (as it is in *Des Cartes*'s meditations) no libertine, if he has any juſtneſs of thought can remain convinced that the ſoul dies with the body."

"This paſſage of Mr. *Arnauld*, ſays *Bayle*, ſhews what advantage may accrue to religion from the hypotheſis oppoſed by *Pomponatius (b)*. It may be made uſe of againſt ſome libertines,

(*b*) The hypotheſis oppoſed by *Pomponatius*, and the hypotheſis of *Des Cartes*, went upon very different principles, as *Mr. Bayle* very well knew. They were however ſo far the ſame, as that both pretended to demonſtrate the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul upon metaphyſical principles; and that is what Mr. *Bayle* means. An hypotheſis which does not want the aid of revelation.

" who will ſee before they believe, and who " deſpiſe the obſcure arguments alledged by di- " vines. Nothing can more effectually reclaim " theſe men, than to convince them of the im- " mortality of the ſoul. It is an inlet to the right " way, and this firſt ſtep may be attended " with happy conſequences."

I beg theſe gentlemen's pardon; they are quite miſtaken. The ſuppoſition is ill *grounded*, and is confuted by the matter of fact every day. The more any man is convinced of the immortality of the ſoul from the principles of *Ariſtotle* or *Des Cartes*, the leſs will he concern himſelf about the truth or falſehood of the goſpel-account of futurity. The conſcious exiſtence of the ſoul after its departure from the body, and its capability of happineſs and miſery in a ſtate of ſeparation, is an obvious and known prejudice againſt the doctrine of a reſurrection of the dead. For to what end a reſurrection, if rewards and puniſhments may be diſpenſed without it?

Arnauld, who was a warm diſputant, might not be aware of this conſequence. But Mr. *Bayle*, if he was in earneſt, is abſolutely inexcuſable in making ſuch a reflection; inaſmuch as by admitting elſewhere, " that, with reſpect to " the proof of a future ſtate, the *dernier reſort* " is to revelation, when the proof from reaſon " and philoſophy fails," he muſt admit that the one ſort of proof is totally diſtinct from and incompatible with the other. If the principles of reaſon and philoſophy procede to demonſtration, how can it be conceived theſe principles ſhould be

be an inlet to a ſort of proof which throws reaſon and philoſophy quite out of the queſtion? Are there any principles of reaſon and philoſophy by which it may be demonſtrated that the dead ſhall be raiſed? He ſuppoſes a certain ſort of men would not believe the immortality of the ſoul, except it could be made plain to them by the principles of reaſon and philoſophy. Why ſo? "Becauſe, ſays he, the arguments of divines are obſcure." Do then the proofs from philoſophy, make theſe arguments clear and perſpicuous? By no means. Theſe arguments are of the ſame weight and force, whether *Ariſtotle*, *Aquinas* and *Des Cartes* are right or wrong. The arguments of divines, i. e. arguments founded on ſcripture for the immortality of man, are ſo far from borrowing any aid from reaſon and philoſophy, that they refer to the *power* and *will* of God, exemplified in a matter of fact, the reſurrection of Jeſus, which reaſon and philoſophy can neither explain nor account for. If the promiſes of God may be depended upon, and if he is able to perform them, men may, and certainly will be raiſed from the dead at the appointed time, whether the ſoul has or has not enjoyed its conſciouſneſs from the period of death, to that of the reſurrection. But on the other hand, if it may be demonſtrated by philoſophical principles, that there is one part of man, which never dies, and which may be delighted or afflicted, rewarded or puniſhed, by the means of its own peculiar feelings or ſenſations, in a ſtate of ſeparation from the other part, it is hardly credible

" who will ſee before they believe, and who " deſpiſe the obſcure arguments alledged by di- " vines. Nothing can more effectually reclaim " theſe men, than to convince them of the im- " mortality of the ſoul. It is an inlet to the right " way, and this firſt ſtep may be attended " with happy conſequences."

I beg theſe gentlemen's pardon; they are quite miſtaken. The ſuppoſition is ill *grounded*, and is confuted by the matter of fact every day. The more any man is convinced of the immortality of the ſoul from the principles of *Ariſtotle* or *Des Cartes*, the leſs will he concern himſelf about the truth or falſehood of the goſpel-account of futurity. The conſcious exiſtence of the ſoul after its departure from the body, and its capability of happineſs and miſery in a ſtate of ſeparation, is an obvious and known prejudice againſt the doctrine of a reſurrection of the dead. For to what end a reſurrection, if rewards and puniſhments may be diſpenſed without it?

Arnauld, who was a warm diſputant, might not be aware of this conſequence. But Mr. *Bayle*, if he was in earneſt, is abſolutely inexcuſable in making ſuch a reflection; inaſmuch as by admitting elſewhere, " that, with reſpect to " the proof of a future ſtate, the *dernier reſort* " is to revelation, when the proof from reaſon " and philoſophy fails," he muſt admit that the one ſort of proof is totally diſtinct from and incompatible with the other. If the principles of reaſon and philoſophy procede to demonſtration, how can it be conceived theſe principles ſhould be

be an inlet to a ſort of proof which throws reaſon and philoſophy quite out of the queſtion? Are there any principles of reaſon and philoſophy by which it may be demonſtrated that the dead ſhall be raiſed? He ſuppoſes a certain ſort of men would not believe the immortality of the ſoul, except it could be made plain to them by the principles of reaſon and philoſophy. Why ſo? "Becauſe, ſays he, the arguments of divines are obſcure." Do then the proofs from philoſophy, make theſe arguments clear and perſpicuous? By no means. Theſe arguments are of the ſame weight and force, whether *Ariſtotle*, *Aquinas* and *Des Cartes* are right or wrong. The arguments of divines, i. e. arguments founded on ſcripture for the immortality of man, are ſo far from borrowing any aid from reaſon and philoſophy, that they refer to the *power* and *will* of God, exemplified in a matter of fact, the reſurrection of Jeſus, which reaſon and philoſophy can neither explain nor account for. If the promiſes of God may be depended upon, and if he is able to perform them, men may, and certainly will be raiſed from the dead at the appointed time, whether the ſoul has or has not enjoyed its conſciouſneſs from the period of death, to that of the reſurrection. But on the other hand, if it may be demonſtrated by philoſophical principles, that there is one part of man, which never dies, and which may be delighted or afflicted, rewarded or puniſhed, by the means of its own peculiar feelings or ſenſations, in a ſtate of ſeparation from the other part, it is hardly credible

credible that God ſhould reſtore that other part to life, to accompliſh a purpoſe which may be brought about without it.

XIII.

1644. While theſe debates were going on abroad between *Des Cartes* and *Gaſſendi*, and their reſpective partizans, little notice ſeems to have been taken of them in our own country, which may be well enough accounted for by the confuſion of the times. All, or the moſt part of theological controverſy turned, in thoſe days, on church power.

However in theſe times, one particular writer who diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the initials R. O. took occaſion in the year 1644, to publiſh a tract intituled, *Man's mortalitie, or a treatiſe wherein it is proved both theologically and philoſophically, that whole man (as a rational creature) is a compound wholly mortal contrary to that common diſtinction of ſoul and body: And that the preſent going of the ſoul into heaven or hell is a mere fiction: And that at the reſurrection is the beginning of our immortality, and then actual condemnation and ſalvation, and not before (c).*

The ſcriptural arguments made uſe of by this author, conſiſt in explanations of, and inferences from the texts that are commonly alledged againſt an intermediate ſtate, and ſolutions of ob-

(c) Said to be printed at *Amſterdam* by *John Canne* 1644. But there was a ſecond edition enlarged, printed at *London*, 1655.

jections

jections taken from ſuch as found another way; wherein, the writer, though in an uncouth manner, ſhews himſelf a maſter of his ſubject.

His philoſophy is wholly of the ſcholaſtic kind, according to the ſyſtems of thoſe times, and the point he chiefly inſiſts upon, is the propagation of ſouls by generation or procreation, in oppoſition to the doctrine of immediate creation or infuſion, at the time of conception. He reckons up no leſs than nineteen different opinions of ancients and moderns, concerning the *ſubſtance* of the ſoul; after which he adds the following ſenſible remark.

" Divers other conceptions and fancies there " be to uphold this ridiculous invention of the " ſoul, traducted from the heathens (who by " the book of nature underſtood an immortality " after death) but through their ignorance how " or which way, this invention, reported to be " *Plato*'s, was occaſioned, and begat a general " belief. And ſo they, and after them the " chriſtians, have thus ſtrained their wits to " ſuch miſerable ſhifts, to define *what it is*, but " neither conclude with any certainty, nor give " ſatisfaction therein *(d)*."

He pitches upon the ſyſtem of *Ariſtotle* for examination, as the moſt intelligible, and at the ſame time moſt in vogue in thoſe days; and, upon the whole, finds no leſs than ſixty-nine abſurdities in the hypotheſis of his opponents.

This writer immediately met with an anſwerer, who, in the warmth of his orthodoxy, calls him,

(d) Page 9.

" a worthleſs pamphleteer, a ſorry animal, who " had ſtep'd into the croud of ſcriblers, in de- " fence of an old rotten hereſy, condemned " and ſuffocated by conſent of the wiſe almoſt " at the hour of the birth;" but is withal, very tender of entring into particulars; touching R. O's ſcripture proofs with great delicacy; and building his fortreſs with the untempered mortar of human authority, from a whole cartload of philoſophers and divines, poets and ſchoolmen, pagan, rabbinical, papiſtical, mahometan and what not, who in reality were juſt as much in agreement with each other, as he was with R. O. as appears by his citing *Scaliger* and *Des Cartes*, along with *Aureolus*, a diſciple of the *angelic* doctor, as ſupporting the ſame ſyſtem concerning the ſoul.

I bring theſe particulars, not with a view of of deciding upon the merits of the controverſy, but merely to ſhew what was doing in our own country during this interval. I procede to ſomething more worth our notice.

XIV.

1663. NICHOLAS PERROT ſieur *d'Ablancourt*, died in the year 1664. A little before his death he ſent a diſcourſe to Mr. *Patru* in defence of his opinion, " that religion, not reaſon, teaches " us the immortality of the ſoul." He ſpeaks of the blindneſs of philoſophers, and particularly of *Ariſtotle*, and probably (for I have not his book at hand) combats his arguments much as *Pomponatius* does. It is not to be ſuppoſed that he

he was ignorant in what way the *peripatetic* philoſophy had been refuted by *Des Cartes*; there are however no references to that ſyſtem, in the extracts given us from *Perrot*'s book in *Bayle*. But he muſt be underſtood to paſs ſentence upon that among the reſt; for he ſays, "Take a view of ALL the ſchools of philoſo-"phy, conſider what they do and teach there. "You will find preſumption in ſome, obſtinacy "in others, and ignorance, error and weakneſs "in them all." He ſays farther, that "provi-"ded he believes that God, by his infinite pow-"er can do things that are impoſſible to nature, "he may be allowed to ſay, that, ſpeaking as "a natural philoſopher, the reſurrection of the "dead is impoſſible *(e)*."

Would you expect after this to find that this very man has admitted, that arguments out of theſe philoſophical ſchools, which abound with preſumption, obſtinacy, ignorance, error, and weakneſs, are good to confirm a ſoul inlightened with grace, in the belief of the immortality of the ſoul? What! when upon the principles of that very philoſophy, the reſurrection of the dead (a doctrine of *grace)* is abſolutely impoſſible? Upon the principles of this philoſophy, the ſoul is capable of exiſting in a ſeparate ſtate, conſcious, active, and percipient of good and evil, pleaſure and pain, happineſs and miſery; by which hypotheſis, all the moral purpoſes of a future ac-

(e) Bayle. Art. PERROT.

count are completely anſwered, and a reſurrection of the dead rendered thereby, uſeleſs, as well as impoſſible.

How is it poſſible that one of theſe doctrines ſhould be ſubſervient to the *confirmation* of the other? What connection can a revelation which inſures a reſurrection of the dead, have with a philoſophy which demonſtrates ſuch reſurrection to be impoſſible?

I cannot help remarking upon this occaſion, the two different ſuppoſitions of Meſſieurs *Arnauld*, and *D'Ablancourt*. The former thinks the philoſophical demonſtration of the natural immortality may be of uſe to bring unbelievers to the knowledge and belief of a future ſtate, as revealed in the ſcriptures; inaſmuch as they are a ſort of men who will admit nothing but what may be known by the light of reaſon, and who are unwilling to begin with *faith (f)*.

Theſe men then we will ſuppoſe, begin with ſtudying the peripatetic or, if you pleaſe, the Carteſian philoſophy. Here they find, according to *D'Ablancourt*, that upon theſe principles, the reſurrection of the dead is impoſſible. And the honour of God in the moral government of the world, being ſufficiently ſecured, by the hypotheſis of a natural immortality, they will be as little diſpoſed to end with the point of faith, as to begin with it.

The ſieur *D'Ablancourt* on the other hand, thinks it neceſſary to begin with the revealed

(f) Bayle. POMPONATIUS. u. s.

doctrine

doctrine of a future ſtate; and, after the mind is ſufficiently inlightened by the doctrines of *grace*, to confirm the faithful with the additional teſtimony of philoſophical concluſions, *i. e.* the concluſions of a philoſophy full of preſumption, obſtinacy, error and ignorance, and which teacheth that the doctrine of grace to be confirmed by it, is an utter impoſſibility.

There is however in all this one conſideration entirely overlooked both by *D'Ablancourt*'s piety, and *Bayle*'s ſcepticiſm. They put the credibility of man's immortality, as revealed in the ſcriptures, to the account of *faith*, without any reſpect to the *reaſonableneſs* of it, in conſequence of certain facts, which in the ſame ſcriptures connect it with the hiſtory of man from the firſt origin of the ſpecies. They conſider not, or conceal, that the doctrine of the goſpel, refers us back to the fall of man, when his title to immortality was forfeited, and that this forfeiture is inconſiſtent with any natural *inherent* principle of life, after the ſentence of death ſhould be executed. To this tranſaction the reſurrection of the dead has reſpect, and is therefore conſidered in the light of redemption, a reverſal of the forfeiture, and a reſtoration to the privileges of life and immortality. Now nothing ſo plain, as that a philoſophy which aſſerts a conſcious, active, and paſſive life to the ſoul of man, in a ſtate of ſeparation from the dead body, during the interval between the fall of Adam, and the appearance of the redeemer, totally overturns the whole chriſtian ſcheme of Salvation, as it muſt

ſuppoſe,

ſuppoſe, that either the ſentence of death, pronounced at the fall, was null and void from the beginning, or that it was ſome way or other reverſed without the interpoſition of a redeemer. And the caſe will be ſtill the ſame whether you begin with the philoſophical argument as *Arnauld* propoſes, or end with it, as *Perrot* adviſes. If you begin with it, and find that kind of proof deciſive and ſatisfactory, you preclude all attention to a ſyſtem founded on facts diametrically oppoſite to theſe philoſophical demonſtrations. If, on the other hand, you are diſpoſed to believe and acquieſce in theſe facts, you can expect nothing from theſe philoſophical diſquiſitions, but to be thrown back into a ſtate of doubt and ſceptical uncertainty to which of two oppoſite ſyſtems you muſt give your aſſent.

XV.

1669. In the year 1669 Mr. (afterwards Biſhop) *Bull* publiſhed his book intituled, *Harmonia Apoſtolica*, the deſign of which was to reconcile St. *Paul* and St. *James* on the article of *Juſtification*. The ſubject engaged him of courſe in a controverſy with ſeveral divines of different ſentiments, and among others with one Mr. *Joſeph Truman*, a learned miniſter among the diſſenters (*g*).

Mr. *Bull* had advanced the following propoſitions.

" 1. The covenant of life made with *Adam* " in his ſtate of innocence, was by his tranſ-

(*g*) See *Nelſon*'s life of Biſhop *Bull* from p. 89 to p. 255.

" greſſion

" greſſion of the ſame, *made void*, not only " for himſelf, but for his poſterity alſo; ſo as " now, all the children of *Adam*, as ſuch, are " the children of death, that is, are excluded " wholly from all promiſe of immortal life, and " and are ſubjected to the neceſſity of death " without any hopes of a reſurrection.

" 2. All thoſe of the poſterity of fallen *Adam* " who are altogether deſtitute of divine revela- " tion, and to whom the *new* covenant of life " [*i. e.* the *chriſtian* covenant] hath not yet been " manifeſt, are under the obligation of no law, " but that of *Nature*.

" 3. The law of nature, which is the dic- " tate of reaſon, ſo far as it is conſidered in fal- " len man, as deſtitute of the ſpirit, and of di- " vine revelation, doth not preſcribe the moſt " perfect and abſolute virtue, nor is an immor- " tal and heavenly life due to the obſervation of " this law.

" 4. God never entered into *any* covenant of " eternal life with the poſterity of fallen *Adam*, " but what was confirmed and eſtabliſhed in " our ſaviour Chriſt: and muſt conſequently " have been the very Goſpel itſelf; according to " that of the apoſtle, *The gift of* GOD *is eternal* " *life, through Jeſus Chriſt our lord (h).*"

In theſe propoſitions it is aſſerted that mankind after the fall of *Adam*, could have no eternal life or immortality but by a new covenant, the covenant of grace in Chriſt; that neither the law

(*h*) *Nelſon* p. 197, 198.

of

of nature nor the law of *Moſes*, had any ſuch covenant; that there could be no hopes of immortality without the hopes of a reſurrection revealed in Chriſt: conſequently by the term *Death* in the firſt propoſition, Mr. *Bull* muſt have meant an extinction of the whole man without any reſerve or ſaving of the life of the ſeparate ſoul; otherwiſe, if either Jew or Gentile had any aſſurance, (whether by *promiſe* or any other means,) of a future life in a ſeparate ſtate of exiſtence, they would, upon that aſſurance or proof, ground ſome *hope* of ſuch future life, to which they would as certainly refer in the courſe of their obedience to their reſpective laws, as if it had been an expreſs ſanction of them.

And thus *Truman* appears to have underſtood him, namely as excluding both Jew and Gentile from all hopes of future life under their reſpective laws, and neceſſarily conſigning them to the fate of fallen *Adam*, *viz.* of utter extinction by death.

Whereupon Mr. *Truman* remonſtrates, on the behalf of the law of *Moſes*, " that this was " putting an indignity upon it, and was in ef- " fect, a reflection upon God himſelf, the au- " thor of it; alledging, that Mr. *Bull* had miſ- " repreſented St. *Paul*, by making him ſay, " that the law did not promiſe ſuch things, as " that a man had need of faith, *the evidence of* " *things not ſeen*, to believe them, but promiſed " only things of ſenſe, not of faith, which " made the law of mount *Sinai*, a diſpenſation

" of

" of ſervitude, fit only to beget in men a mean " and ſervile diſpoſition of mind *(i)*."

Mr. *Bull* it ſeems, could not ſtand againſt this reproach, and therefore bethought himſelf to ſay, " that Providence took ſufficient care " that the Jews ſhould not ſtick in the letter of " the mount-*Sinai*-law, but look beyond it," which he makes out thus.

" God *provided* that the *tradition* of *life to* " *come*, derived down from the Patriarchs, ei- " ther immediately from himſelf, or otherwiſe, " might flouriſh under the law; and be both " expounded and confirmed by the ſermons of " the prophets, whom he raiſed up in the ſeve- " ral ages, for inſtruction and conduct to his " people. He (Mr. *Bull)* ſaith, the patriarchal " condition [*I ſuppoſe he means*, of exiſting in " a ſeparate ſtate] is clear, both by the prophe- " cy and example of *Enoch*; and that the ſub- " ſiſtence of the ſoul after the death of the body, " was *hence* believed by the moſt ancient Jews; " who lived after the delivery of the law of " *Moſes*. And this he eſpecially gathereth and " confirmeth from the hiſtory of king *Saul*; con- " ſulting the *Pythoneſs* of *Endor*, and ſeeking of " Her, that he might have ſome diſcourſe with " *Samuel* that was then dead, which he would " never certainly have done, had he not believed " the ſoul of the deceaſed prophet to ſurvive. " He (the ſame Mr. *Bull)* argueth alſo to the " ſame effect from the original of *Necromancy*,

(*i*) *Nelſon*, p. 202.

" the moſt ancient of all divinations, founded " on the ſeparate ſubſiſtence of the ſoul *(k)*."

Not having Biſhop *Bull*'s book at hand, I tranſcribe this from Mr. *Nelſon*, who calls the foregoing propoſitions, " the *Pillars* upon which " Mr. *Bull*'s ſuper-ſtructure doth ſubſiſt." Theſe pillars however, we ſee in the laſt citation, he was obliged to demoliſh and to bury his whole hypotheſis in the rubbiſh of them. For,

1. By ſetting the two caſes together it appears, that though God entered into no covenant of life with the Jews, but that, as ſons of *Adam*, they were, notwithſtanding their law, ſubjected to the neceſſity of death, yet that they were provided, and by God himſelf, with a tradition *of life to come*, in the doctrine of the ſeparate ſubſiſtence of the ſoul, to which they might truſt as ſafely as to an expreſs covenant, it being *expounded* and *confirmed* by the ſermons of their prophets. Hence,

2. It follows that the Jews were under *a neceſſity* and *no neceſſity* of death at the ſame time. And,

3. That the unbelieving Jews were not ſo far wrong in rejecting the goſpel as Chriſtians, are apt to ſuppoſe; inaſmuch as they had, if not a covenant, yet a *confirmed* and *eſtabliſhed tradition*, provided by God himſelf, of a future life, which as it would keep their hopes alive, would likewiſe influence their obedience, equally with a new covenant, which differed from

(*k*) Ibid. p. 203.

it

it only in the circumſtances of a reſurrection. And,

4. That the Gentiles had juſt as much reaſon and encouragement to look beyond the law of nature, as the Jews had to look beyond the law of *Sinai:* for they too, if Mr. *Bull* is right, had the *tradition* of the ſeparate ſubſiſtance, and, it ſhould ſeem in as great perfection as the Jews. For Necromancy undoubtedly had its original among the idolatrous Gentiles, and if, as Mr. *Bull* imagined, it took its original from the ſeparate ſubſiſtance of the ſoul, that doctrine muſt have been as clearly expounded and confirmed among them, as it was among the Jews.

Beſides theſe infirmities in the reaſoning part, Mr *Bull* ſeems to me to have made a little too free with ſcripture hiſtory in deriving this *tradition* to the Jews.

He ſays the Jews derived the belief of the ſeparate ſubſiſtance from the prophecy and example of *Enoch.* What *prophecy* he refers to, I cannot ſo much as conjecture: I am ſure there is none ſuch in the bible; and if the Jews derived the belief of the ſeparate ſubſiſtence from the tranſlation of *Enoch,* they derived it from an *example* where the ſoul and body were never *ſeparated* at all. The biſhop of *Glouceſter* has retailed this idle notion, after biſhop *Bull,* in the *Divine Legation,* &c. and ſays *it could not be but* the Jews might infer a ſeparate exiſtence from the ſtory of *Enoch.* As if *ſome* men, in

certain caſes, were *under a neceſſity* of drawing concluſions where they have no premiſſes?

Again, I ſhould be glad to know upon what ſcriptural grounds Mr. *Bull* affirmed, that *Necromancy* was founded upon the doctrine of the ſeparate ſubſiſtence of the ſoul. He tells us indeed, that "*Saul* believed the ſoul of the pro-"phet *Samuel* ſurvived his body, otherwiſe he "certainly would not have ſought of the *Py-*"*thoneſs* of *Endor* to have ſome diſcourſe with "*Samuel* who was dead." But the hiſtory gives him no authority for this. The *ſoul* of *Samuel* is not once mentioned during the whole tranſaction, and in what manner the charms and incantations of thoſe times were *underſtood* to operate upon the dead, I will venture to affirm, no body knows *(l)*.

But admit the Jews had the *tradition* of life to come, by the way of a ſeparate exiſtence, of what uſe was it to them? which of them appears to have been induced by it to look beyond the letter of the mount *Sinai* law? The Right Reverend author of the *Divine Legation* &c. who allows that the Jews adopted the *tradition*, tells

(*l*) No one more likely to know this than our great *Selden*. Yet he, giving an account of this matter, only ſays, *A mortuis autem et expectabant ut, per inſomnia de rebus quas ſciſcitabantur juxta ſepulchra pernoctantes, fierent certiores*; *et* Pythoniſſarum *ope etiam evocatas eorum ſpecies, uti de Samuele traditur, conſulebant.* De Dis Syris. Syntag. 1. Cap. 2. And *Maimonides*, whom he immediately quotes, ſeems to have been no better informed. See likewiſe Bp. *Clayton*'s Chronology of the Hebrew Bible, p. 248---252.

us they made *no intereſting ſpeculations* upon it, and that it was a doctrine which *floated idly upon their minds (m)*. And indeed we ſhould have reaſon to be ſatisfied that this was the worſt, if Biſhop *Bull* had not told us, that the doctrine of the ſeparate ſubſiſtence of the ſoul was the parent of *Necromancy*, one of the *abominations* which the Jews were moſt expreſsly forbidden to practice, *(n)* and they would hardly be guiltleſs in entertaining any *tradition* that ſhould encourage it.

Thus it too frequently happens that learned men being ſtruck with the plainneſs and perſpicuity of Goſpel truth, and ardently diſpoſed, to do juſtice to it, being met in their road by ſome unlucky *ſyſtematical* point, have been obliged, in apprehenſion of church-cenſure, to turn out of their way, and either to retract and deſert their cauſe, or to compromiſe matters ſo, as to render the moſt valuable part of their labours of no effect. This it ſeems was the unhappy caſe of good Biſhop *Bull*. "So that after all, "ſays Mr. *Nelſon*, the difference betwixt Mr. "*Truman* and Mr. *Bull*, will be found very in-"conſiderable."

XVI.

Between the years 1692 and 1694, Meſſieurs *Jurieu* and *Saurin* were engaged in much theo- 1692. 1694.

(m) *Div. Leg. Vol.* ii. part ii. p. 188. edit. 1758.
(n) Deut. xviii. 11th.

logical

logical altercation on various ſubjects; and among other things incidentally, on the proof of the natural immortality of the ſoul. *Jurieu* charged *Saurin* with latitudinarian principles, in aſcribing too much to *reaſon* and the principles of natural religion, in demonſtrating the truths of the Chriſtian ſcheme, which Mr. *Jurieu* conſidered as points of *faith*. With reſpect to the immortality of the ſoul, he ſaid, " that though " he himſelf believed that matter is not capable " of any ſenſation or knowledge, yet he had " no diſtinct idea, no clear perception of that " truth, nor could he prove it to thoſe who " ſhould deny it. What I perceive in it, ſays " he, is confuſed and indiſtinct.—Can Mr. *Sau-* " *rin* and his *rational* collegues ſay in conſcience " that they have a clear conception, and diſ- " tinct idea of the immortality of the ſoul *(o)* ?"

Saurin anſwers, " I have a clear perception " and a diſtinct idea of the immortality of the " ſoul. I know that the ſoul is a ſpiritual and " indiviſible ſubſtance, which can only be de- " ſtroyed by annihilation.—Muſt a chriſtian " philoſopher be leſs orthodox than *Plato?* " Muſt he give the preference to *Epicurus*, " when he draws up a parallel of the ancient " philoſophers ?"

Every one knows in how many inſtances *Saurin* was victorious in his diſputes with *Jurieu*. Every one knows too, that *Bayle* omitted no opportunity of exhibiting *Saurin* in his triumphal

(*o*) *Bayle* POMPONACE. [F]

carr

carr, with the unfortunate *Jurieu* bound to the wheels of it. In the preſent caſe however, Mr. *Bayle* is candid enough to acknowledge that *Saurin*'s anſwer is weak and impertinent, and therefore, he [*Bayle*] undertakes to rectifie it.

" Mr. *Jurieu*, ſays he, plainly ſuppoſes that " in order to have a diſtinct idea of the ſpiritu- " ality of the ſoul, we muſt clearly apprehend " that matter is not capable of any ſenſation or " knowledge. How comes it then that Mr. " *Saurin* leaves this unanſwered? Should he not " have ſaid, that he has a diſtinct idea, and " clear perception, whereby he knows that an " extended ſubſtance cannot have any ſenſation?"

But how would this have mended the matter? For this at beſt, is but a *negative* idea, importing that Mr. *Saurin* knew not that extended ſubſtance can have any ſenſation: and he would certainly have been told that his *ignorance* of the capability of corporeal or extended ſubſtance for thought and ſenſation, could never exhibit to him a clear and diſtinct idea of the ſpirituality of the ſoul. Mr. *Saurin* was therefore in the right to affirm *poſitively* that he had a clear and diſtinct idea of the immortality of the ſoul, without entering into particulars. This put the queſtion entirely upon Mr. *Saurin*'s powers of conception, of which no other perſon could be a judge. No one could contradict him, any more than if he had affirmed, that he diſtinctly conceived the ſun to be a large globe of ice.

Mr. *Bayle* goes on. " 2. It is not ſufficient " to know that the ſoul cannot be deſtroyed but

" by

" by annihilation, for the ſame may be ſaid of " extenſion, and yet trees and beaſts are mor- " tal. Mr. *Saurin* ſhould therefore have ex- " preſſed himſelf thus. *I know the ſoul cannot* " *ſubſiſt without thought; the diſtinct idea I have* " *of a thinking ſubſtance teaches me, that if it* " *were deprived of thought, it would ceaſe to ex-* " *iſt.*"

But would not *Jurieu* have immediately aſked him whether he was conſcious that his ſoul thought in the profoundeſt ſleep? And whether without this conſciouſneſs he could be ſure that the ſoul *always* thinks? This however Dr. *Watts* himſelf, who ventures as much for his hypotheſis as any man, durſt not affirm; but contents himſelf with ſaying, " that the ſoul " *may* think in the profoundeſt ſleep, and yet " the remembrance (*i. e.* the conſciouſneſs) of " that thinking *may*, to the waking man, be " utterly loſt *(p)*." *Jurieu* would have laughed at *Saurin* for pretending to have a diſtinct idea of a ſubſtance whoſe exiſtence depended upon a circumſtance impoſſible to be aſcertained.

But moſt probably, *Saurin*, whatever he might think, had *another* reaſon for not anſwering in the manner ſuggeſted by Mr. *Bayle*. To ſay that the ſoul ceaſes to be as ſoon as it is deprived of thought, is to place the ſubſtance of the ſoul in the *actus cogitandi*, after the *Carteſians*, who had occaſionally been preſſed by their adverſaries ſo far, as to find themſelves obliged to acknow-

(*p*) Eſſays 8vo. 1733. p.

ledge

ledge, that the *actus cogitandi* ſtood in need of ſuch immediate and continual ſupport from God, as amounted to a continual creation.

And here the *Remonſtrants* ſtruck in, and demanded how God could be continually creating the *actus cogitandi*, without being the immediate author of *evil* as well as *good* thoughts *(q)*?

What would *Jurieu* have ſaid, had *Saurin* given this opening to the common enemy? 'Tis true Mr. *Saurin*, by his tergiverſation, ſubjected himſelf to a ſuſpicion, that his clear and diſtinct idea of the ſoul was nothing better than an idea formed upon an argument *ab ignoto*. But this was a ſmall matter in compariſon of the clamours of a conſiſtory, inflamed by *Jurieu*'s remonſtrances. Mr. *Saurin* therefore acted *wiſely* in touching the philoſophical argument as tenderly as poſſible; and in ſhielding himſelf in the moral argument, drawn from the divine juſtice, unequal diſtributions, *&c.* even though he could not be ignorant, that theſe principles equally favoured the reſtitution of the *whole man*, after a period of inſenſibility; and have indeed no particular tendency to illuſtrate thoſe phyſical qualities upon which the natural immortality of the ſoul is ſuppoſed to depend.

" Muſt a chriſtian philoſopher, ſays Mr. *Sau-*
" *rin* be leſs orthodox than *Plato?*" Was *Plato*'s philoſophy then, and the chriſtian philoſophy taught in the New Teſtament, the ſame? So it ſeems thought Mr. *Saurin*, in this point at leaſt;

(q) *Curcellæus* Rel. Chriſt. Inſtit. lib. iii. cap. 2. ſect. 9.

and ſo indeed have thought moſt of the curators of *orthodoxy*, from the reign of LEO X. to this preſent moment.

XVII.

1697. But about the year 1697, upon occaſion of Mr. *Locke*'s diſpute with Bp. *Stilling fleet*, *chriſtian philoſophy* began to be a little better underſtood. Mr. *Locke* had ſaid, that the immateriality of the ſoul could not be demonſtrated. The biſhop alledged that ſuch a ſuppoſition leſſened the credibility of the immortality of the ſoul. Mr. *Locke* replied, that, " that was to ſuppoſe " that divine revelation abates of its credibility " in all thoſe articles it propoſes, proportionably " as human reaſon fails to ſupport the teſtimony " of God. Your Lordſhip, continues Mr. *Locke*, " ſays, you do not queſtion whether God can " give immortality to a material ſubſtance: but " you ſay, it takes off very much from the " evidence of immortality, if it depends wholly " on God's giving that which of its own na- " ture it is not capable of. To which I reply, " any one's not being able to demonſtrate the " ſoul to be immaterial, takes off not very much " nor at all from the evidence of its immorta- " lity, if God has revealed that it ſhall be im- " mortal; becauſe the veracity of God, is a " demonſtration of the truth of what he has " revealed: and the want of another demon- " ſtration of a propoſition that is demonſtrably " true, takes not off from the evidence of it. " For where there is a clear demonſtration,

" there

" there is as much evidence as any truth can
" have that is not ſelf evident (*r*).

The compiler of Mr. *Locke*'s article in the *Biographia Britannica*, who ſeems to have an *inbred* averſion to Mr. *Locke*'s political, as well as theological principles, calls this a *ſophiſm*, and ſays that " *Locke* ſubſtitutes here the vera-
" city of God, inſtead of ſcripure evidence,
" which only amounts to high probability."

But the critic forgot that Mr. *Locke* was here diſputing, not with a *ſceptic* or an *infidel*, but with a *chriſtian biſhop*, who acknowledged the ſcripture to be a really *divine revelation*, and nothing can be more diſgraceful to the memory of Dr. *S.* than to ſuppoſe, after all he has written on the ſubject, that he conſidered the ſcriptural evidence for chriſtianity, as amounting only to *high probability*. But for this malevolence the Biographer hath been chaſtiſed elſewhere (*s*). But what is it theſe demonſtrators would be at?

(*r*) Eſſay on Hum. Underſtanding, 8vo. vol. ii. p. 155, ed. 1715.

(*s*) See a pamphlet intituled, *A Review of ſome paſſages in the laſt edition of* The Divine Legation of *Moſes* demonſtrated; printed for *R. Baldwin* in *Pater-noſter Row*, 1760. pag. 64, 65. The Jacobites of the laſt age received the ſcriptures, and many things of leſs value, as of divine authority, on the *ſole* teſtimony of the *church*. But *Bolingbroke*, their *guide*, *philoſopher*, and *friend*, having deſerted this ſtronghold, they ſeem to attend him in theſe laſt days, with equal eagerneſs into the regions of infidelity. Whether our *Biographers* are of this clan I preſume not to determine. Let their works ſpeak for them. Or if any one wants to know their character, at a ſhorter cut, let him apply to the *poor penitent thief*, who publiſhed an account of a caſtrated Letter of St. *Thomas Hanmer* in the winter 1763. pag. 19.

Will they pretend that they can demonſtrate the immateriality of the human ſoul? One of them indeed has undertaken it; and on that ſcore, has merited a fulſome elogium from a noted doctor who need not be named; but with this moſt unlucky drawback, "that the immateriality of "the ſouls of brutes may be demonſtrated by "the very ſame proceſs," and conſequently the immortality of brutes proved by the very ſame medium.

On another hand, when you have demonſtrated the immateriality of the human ſoul, what is it to the purpoſe of proving its *conſciouſneſs* unleſs you can demonſtrate that the immaterial ſoul, *as ſuch, always thinks?* But this I preſume the moſt ſanguine Carteſian of the preſent *age*, would not anſwer for. And what moral purpoſe can it anſwer, or indeed what purpoſe at all, to prove the immortality of a ſoul whoſe conſciouſneſs, for ought that appears to the contrary, may be ſuſpended for an indefinite number of ages.

It has always appeared to me extremely ſtrange that Chriſtian Divines ſhould have been ſo zealous for theſe metaphyſical arguments for the natural immortality, which, if I underſtand the ſcriptures, are by no means conſiſtent with the account thoſe ſacred records give us of the immortality of man.

The doctrine of the New Teſtament is, that men ſhall become immortal by the way of a reſurrection of the dead, a reſtoration of the whole man to life; and the *N. T.* is ſo far from acknowledging any intermediate conſciouſneſs in

man,

man, between death and the reſurrection, that it always ſpeaks of that interval as a *ſleep*, which implies a ſuſpenſion of the thinking faculty, a reſt from thoſe labours, which require thought, memory, conſciouſneſs, &c. during which thoſe faculties are *uſeleſs*.

But this is not all. The ſcriptural ſyſtem of immortality, ſuppoſes that man had forfeited his original title to immortality, and would never have recovered it but for the interpoſition of a redeemer. The conſequence of this doctrine is, that between the time of the forfeiture, and the actual appearance of the Redeemer, the dead could have life in no ſenſe at all: and that neither before nor after the appearance of the Redeemer, dead men were or would be reſtored to life, otherwiſe than in the way revealed by the Redeemer, namely a reſurrection of the dead.

Hence to ſuppoſe the ſouls of dead men to be alive, conſcious and active, and capable of happineſs and miſery, from the death of the firſt man, to the reſurrection of the very laſt, and to pretend to *demonſtrate* this by reaſon and philoſophy, is plainly to overturn the whole Chriſtian ſyſtem.

Pomponatius therefore was not ſo *inſolent*, as Mr. Le *Noble* would make him, when he ſaid, that " whoever went about to prove the immor-
" tality of the ſoul by philoſophical arguments,
" does not deſerve the name of a chriſtian *(t)*."

(t) Bayle. *Pomponace* (G) cit. 62.

We

We ſee there are good reaſons for this cenſure. It was properly and juſtly turning the tables upon thoſe who had dignified him with the name of *heretic* and *impious*.

Whoever carefully peruſes Mr. *Locke*'s Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, will perceive that the ſame concluſion may be drawn from the poſitions of that great man, who brought upon himſelf the irreconcileable enmity of Infidels and Bigots, as much perhaps by that immortal work, as by his metaphyſical diſquiſitions. The firſt found themſelves diſlodged by it from their ſtrong hold whence they had ſo long combated the *cui bono* of revelation, which however was a ſmall matter with the artificial Theologiſts, who found their account ſo many different ways in the doctrine of the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul. A doctrine of which they are ſo extremely tenacious, that they fail not to impute infidelity, and even impiety to every one who attempts to deprive them of it, even upon the authority of ſcripture. Of which the next article affords a moſt remarkable example.

XVIII.

1702. In the year 1702, Dr. *William Coward* a Phyſician, under the fictitious name of *Eſtibius Pſychalethes*, publiſhed a book intituled, *Second Thoughts concerning human ſoul, demonſtrating the notion of human ſoul, as believed to be a ſpiritual, immortal ſubſtance united to human body, to be a plain heatheniſh invention, and not conſonant to the principles of philoſophy, reaſon, or religion.*

[*But*

[*But the ground only of many abſurd and ſuperſtitious opinions, abominable to the reformed churhes, and derogatory in general to true Chriſtianity*] printed for *R. Baſſet* at the *Mitre*, over againſt *Chancery-Lane*, *Fleet-ſtreet (u)*.

This book the Dr. dedicated to the clergy of the church of *England*, profeſſing at his ſetting out, "that the main ſtreſs of arguments, either "to confound or ſupport his opinion, muſt be "drawn from thoſe only credentials of true "and orthodox divinity, the lively oracles of "God, the holy ſcriptures." And again, in anſwer to the queſtion, *Doth man die like a brute beaſt?* he ſays, "Yes, in reſpect of their end "in this life; both their deaths conſiſt in a pri-"vation of life (for which he quotes *Eccleſ.* iii. "19.) But then, continues he, man has this "prerogative or pre-eminence above a brute, "that he will be raiſed to life again, and be "made partaker of eternal happineſs in the "world to come."

But notwithſtanding theſe, and as many other proofs of a firm and ſerious attachment to the authority of the chriſtian ſcriptures, as it is in any man's power to give under his hand, this ſame Dr. *Coward* has commonly made one in the liſt with, *Toland*, *Tindal*, *Collins*, &c. reputed to be the moſt rancorous and determined adverſaries of Chriſtianity. And ſuch

(*u*) The words within the brackets are omitted in the title-page of the ſecond edition, printed for *A. Baldwin* near the *Oxford Arms Inn* in *Warwick Lane*. 1704.

is the malignant nature of indiſcriminate calumny, that ſome worthy perſons of the preſent times, who think as *Coward* did (though probably for reaſons a little different from thoſe he gives) have found themſelves obliged to diſown all acquaintance with him, and indeed have ſufficiently made it appear (by the wrong accounts they give of his book, retailed from informers who certainly never read it) that whereever they had their principles, or their materials, it could not be from Dr. *Coward (x)*.

Theſe were the uniform ſentiments of the orthodox concerning Dr. *Coward*, till Mr. *Caleb Fleming* took it into his head to commit himſelf with the ſoul ſleepers, upon a new plan. This ſagacious perſon, finding that *Coward* had formed an argument againſt the ſeparate exiſtence of the human ſoul, upon the notion of an hypoſtatic union of the divine and human nature in Chriſt, immediately proclaimed the ſaid *Coward*, an arrant *Churchiſt*, *evidently fond of myſtery*, and as deep in the practice of *cramming down* the throats of ſimple mortals, *unmaſticated doctrines* as the moſt rigid bigot of them all; and upon this ſuppoſition attacks him in form *(y)*.

But

(*x*) See the learned Mr. *Peckard*'s Farther Obſervations, &c. p. 30, 31.

(*y*) See *Coward*'s Second Thoughts, p. 152, Ed. 2d. And compare with *Fleming*'s Survey of the Search after ſouls, p. 22. where Mr. *Fleming*'s candor and capacity are remarkably diſplayed. Mr. *Fleming* would have been intituled to an entire article in this collection, upon account of the ſingularity

But Dr. *Coward*, as hath been obſerved, met, in his day, with opponents of a very different com-

gularity of his hypotheſis, if he could have found language either to expreſs his own ſenſe, or fairly to repreſent the ſenſe of thoſe he would be underſtood to oppoſe. For example. " The following Eſſay, ſays he, attempts to give " the argument of a continued conſciouſneſs its *energy*; " which [energy] does ſuppoſe the ſoul of man is of ſuch a " nature, that, if it ſhall exiſt at all in a future ſtate, that " exiſtence muſt be abſolutely ſeparate from and indepen- " dent on this mortal body, though not ſeparate from a " ſpiritual even a reſurrection-body." *Survey*, p. 177. It ſhould ſeem then, ſo far as any meaning can be picked out of this jargon, that the conſciouſneſs of the human ſoul, cannot be *continued* in a future ſtate, unleſs it be inveſted with a reſurrection-body. But then to what purpoſe does he immediately before, cite, with the utmoſt approbation, that *rhapſody* from *Price*'s Review? which implies, that the ſoul, or the intellectual nature in man, poſſeſſes its conſciouſneſs independent of *all* body? So much for Mr. *Fleming*'s manner of expreſſing *his own* ſenſe. Let us now ſee how he deals with that of his opponents. His ſcheme is " that the ſoul " upon the death of the mortal body, inſtead of waiting till " that future period, when the *general* reſurrection is ſup- " poſed to commence, is immediately, and inſtantaneouſly " cloathed with its reſurrection-body: and Dr. *Law* having obſerved that " the time of each man's death is, *in reſpect of* " *himſelf*, really contiguous to that of his reſurrection," (*Conſiderations* p. 174. Ed. 2d.) Mr. *Fleming* deſires to avail himſelf of this teſtimony, which he does in the following manner. " Now what is contiguous with [*he ſhould have* " *availed himſelf of* Dr. Law's *Engliſh, and have written*, to] " the time of a man's death, muſt be ſo near as to *touch* " that time; there will, there can be no ſeparating interval, " for if there be, it will not be contiguous: no intervening " moments can be admitted. Contiguity admits not of ſe- " paration either in time or in ſpace." *Survey*. p. 277. This might have paſſed for an *innocent* blunder, if it had been made before the *Surveyor* had ſeen Dr. *Law*'s Appendix, which indeed did not appear till ſome years after the ſecond

complexion, as well as ſuperior abilities. Such as Dr. *Nichols*, in his *Conference* with a *Theiſt*. Mr. *John Broughton*, in a tract intituled, *Pſychologia, &c.* and *John Turner*, M. A. in a *Vindication of the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul*, from a late author's *ſecond Thoughts*, &c. This laſt was the only treatiſe to which *Coward* made a formal reply, in a ſmall pamphlet, intituled, *Further Thoughts on ſecond Thoughts*, to which Mr. *Turner* rejoyned. The little more that is known of Dr. *Coward*, may be found in *Wood*'s Ath. Oxon. p. 899.

XIX.

1706. But though Dr. *Coward* himſelf wanted either inclination or opportunity to defend his book

Edition of the *Conſiderations*, from which Mr. *Fleming* cites this paſſage; and ſuch a head as his may be eaſily conceived to overlook the words, *in reſpect of himſelf*. But unhappily for Mr. *Fleming*'s *honeſty*, he, in the ſame page, quotes this very *Appendix*, in which Dr. *Law* explains himſelf beyond the poſſibility of miſtake. For ſpeaking to an objection brought from 2 *Cor.* v. 6---8. he ſays, "This is "ſtrictly true, ſince *time unperceived, making no diſtance or* "*difference*, the ſeaſon of each perſon's recompenſe coin-"cides with that of his death; and therefore to be *abſent* "from our *natural* body, is to be cloathed with a *ſpiritual* "one." *Appendix.* p. 394. It is remarkable that this Mr. *Fleming* is for ever hauling the doctrine of the *Trinity* into his *ſurvey*, where it has no manner of buſineſs, and he tells us, p. 101, 102, how cleverly he eſcaped the clutches of a popiſh Prieſt by explaining his creed upon that head. It had been much more to his purpoſe to have informed us how he *would have* eſcaped, with his *inſtantaneous reſurrection-body*, had the Prieſt attacked him on the Articles of PURGATORY and SAINT-WORSHIP, and had been maſter of his trade.

againſt

againſt all theſe formidable opponents, he had the good fortune to be ſeconded by a very able advocate, who replied ſeparately and diſtinctly to the three writers abovementioned, not overlooking Mr. *Turner*'s reply to *Second* Thoughts.

This advocate was *Henry Layton*, Eſq; a Gentleman of an ancient family and a handſome eſtate at *Rawden*, in the County of *York*. His father is ſaid to have been maſter of the jewel-office to K. *Charles* I. *Henry* his ſon was educated at *Oxford*, and afterwards at *Grays-Inn*, in the ſtudy of the Law, and was called to the Bar; but made no other uſe of his profeſſion (in which however he was very able) than to do good offices, among his neighbours without fee or reward.

His diſpoſition led him to ſpeculations of another kind, particularly to a long and laborious diſquiſition into the nature of the ſoul, chiefly with reſpect to its *ſeparate* exiſtence; the evidence for and againſt which, he inveſtigated with the utmoſt avidity of coming at the truth, examining every thing he could meet with, ancient and modern, on the ſubject; and having found reaſon to determine for the negative, he made no ſcruple of oppoſing the ſentiments of ſome of the greateſt heroes of his own time.

I have called this writer, Dr. *Coward*'s advocate; not that he was *profeſſedly* ſuch, but becauſe, as he entered upon the controverſy before *Coward*, ſo he purſued it after him, in confutation of thoſe opponents whom *Coward*'s book had ſet to work: declaring however that he had

no view but to the general queſtion, without making himſelf anſwerable for *Coward*'s arguments or expreſſions, or becoming bound by his or any other perſons conceſſions or qualifying reſerves. It is indeed doubtful whether he ever read COWARD's *Second Thoughts*. It is certain at leaſt that when he wrote his *Obſervations on Nichols's Conference with a Theiſt*, he did not know that *Eſtibius*, one of the ſpeakers in it, was the name ſubſcribed by *Coward* to the dedication of his *Second Thoughts*; but rather ſeems to have imagined that himſelf was the perſon intended by *Nichols* to be confuted under that appellation.

I have been the more particular in this account of Mr. *Layton*, as it is probable his works, though printed in two Volumes quarto, were never formally publiſhed, or expoſed to ſale under the patronage of a Bookſeller; and I am inclined to believe, that the few copies now to be met with, were originally preſents to his friends. He complains, in one place, that he could not procure an *imprimatur* for his obſervations on Dr. *Bentley*'s ſecond ſermon at *Boyle*'s lecture. And as the reſt of his pieces have in them the ſame *heretical taint*, we may ſuppoſe that they ſtole into light through ſome private preſs. It is hardly accountable otherwiſe, that a writer of Mr. *Layton*'s learning and abilities ſhould have remained for ſo long a time in ſuch obſcurity, that it is queſtionable whether either his name or his writings were ever mentioned in any printed book, before Mr. *Fleming*, the

ſurveyor

ſurveyor above-mentioned, undertook to give a miſtaken and inconſiſtent account of them, as the works of Dr. *Coward*.

As Mr. *Layton* conſiders and anſwers every argument that had then been advanced in behalf of the immortality of the ſoul, at full length, there is no giving an abſtract of his diſquiſitions within any reaſonable compaſs: I ſhall therefore only exhibit one or two of his anſwers to ſuch popular reaſons as his friends offered, by way of deterring him from an undertaking that was likely to be ſo offenſive to the orthodox.

" You ſay, (ſays he, to one of them) *The opi-*
" *nion is bold, ſingular, and heretical.*

" That there is a degree of boldneſs and ſin-
" gularity in it, I do not deny; but I ſay it is
" not ſo great a degree of either as I took it to
" be when I writ my treatiſe, witneſs the many
" quotations, reported in this writing. It fared
" with me as it did with *Elijah*, who thought he
" was the only true ſervant which God had in
" *Iſrael*; but it was revealed to him, that there
" were ſeven thouſand ſuch left in *Iſrael*, al-
" though he knew nothing of them."

" To the word *heretical*, I read in K. *James*
" the firſt his Apology, fol. 302. of his works,
" *That he thought himſelf acquitted of that charge,*
" *by his profeſſing to believe the ſcripture, and*
" *the three moſt ancient Creeds; his ſubmiſſion to*
" *the four firſt great or general Councils, and to*
" *what the Fathers of the firſt five hundred years*
" *did agree upon as neceſſary to ſalvation.*

" Here

" Here are *your* rules for examination of he-
" reſies, and none of theſe trials do I refuſe. But
" till proofs riſe from ſome of theſe grounds, my
" anſwer to this expreſſion ſhall be the words of
" *Moſes*. Numb. xvi. 7. [*Ye take too much upon*
" *you, ye ſons of Levi.*]

" —— You ſay, *The opinion opens a gap to*
" *Atheiſm, and Diſobedience; and encourages men*
" *to prefer their private fancies, before the wiſ-*
" *dom and authority of the Church.*

" To this I ſay, Our primitive Reformers
" have (in anſwer to their Popiſh ſuperiors)
" fully anſwered this objection; and to them
" I refer you for an anſwer, with this addition,
" that if your propoſition were irrefragable, *er-*
" *rors* grown general, would prove irremedi-
" able.

" You ſay, *The opinion tends to promote vice,*
" *and that the ſoul's ſeparate ſubſiſtence is the*
" *ſtrongeſt foundation of piety and religion.*

" But I cannot grant any of theſe conſequen-
" ces to be neceſſary or probable; but do ſay,
" that our Lord's direction, *to fear God who can*
" *both kill and caſt into hell*, ſtands firm and un-
" ſhaken: and the paſſing an intermediate time
" betwixt death and judgment, (which time to
" the dead is nothing) doth no way infeeble the
" certainty of future rewards and puniſhments;
" but places the expectation of them upon a right
" and a firm foot or foundation, maintained by
" a concurrent teſtimony throughout the ſcrip-
" ture, and fortified by the articles of our ſe-
" veral Creeds; a truth of which, ſince Chriſt's

" time,

" time, there never was any doubt; nor can be
" by any who do acknowledge the authority of
" the ſcripture.

" You ſay, *Men may except againſt the reſur-*
" *rection alſo.* And I grant it: for ſome do it
" daily, againſt the Being or Government of the
" Deity. But this doth not ſtrengthen your in-
" ference, that, becauſe men queſtion and ex-
" plode an opinion which appears to be not well
" grounded, therefore they will do the ſame by
" another opinion that is well grounded, and
" founded upon a rock.

" True it is, that our churches, for about the
" laſt 1200 years, have been ſo poſſeſt with the
" conceit of a ſeparately ſubſiſting ſoul, that
" they have made little uſe of *the reſurrection* in
" their exhortations. And in truth, if the ſoul,
" parting from the body, go preſently to heaven
" or hell, our article of the reſurrection, can
" be but of ſmall uſe in the church. If ſouls
" get amongſt bleſſed angels in heaven, what
" need can there be to them of a reſurrection?
" It ſeems rather a loſs and harm to them to en-
" ter again into bodies, and come out of hea-
" ven to inhabit on earth again, although it be
" a new earth, *wherein dwells righteouſneſs.*
" There have been teſtimonies all along in the
" church againſt the ſeparate ſubſiſtence of ſouls,
" except in the 600 years wherein the thick
" darkneſs of popiſh ignorance overſpread the

" Chriſtian

" Chriſtian world, *viz.* from *An.* 600 till *An.* " 1200 *(z)*."

Thus far Mr. *Layton*, who may be ſuppoſed to have made his inquiries, with the more ſincerity, as the ſubject was not ſuggeſted by any thing he had read in favour of the ſide which he at length eſpouſed. It is a little remarkable, that the oppoſers of Mr. *Layton*'s opinion, ſhould make uſe of the ſame arguments, or rather bugbears, to deter him from purſuing his inquiries, that the papiſts did in the infancy of the reformation. The *authority of the church*, the *imputation of hereſy*, and even of *Atheiſm*, the *promoting of vice*, by taking away the fear of *purgatorial pains*, &c. It is, I ſay, remarkable, but not at all wonderful, for the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, is one of thoſe doctrines which popery borrowed from paganiſm, and is ſo neceſſary to the ſupport of the better half of the popiſh ſuperſtitions, that it is not a little marvellous the reformers ſhould think ſo little of removing the ground work, when they were ſo zealouſly bent upon demoliſhing what was built upon it.

XX.

1729. I paſs by innumerable multitudes of tracts on the immortality of the ſoul, which were publiſhed for twenty years after the period laſt under conſideration; partly becauſe they were aim-

(z) Search after Souls. Part ii. p. 21, 22, 23.

ed

ed at infidels, who were not ſuppoſed to acknowledge any future ſtate at all, and partly becauſe they contained little more than repetitions of what had been ſaid an hundred times before: and paſs on to the year 1729 when the learned Mr. *Joſeph Hallet*, jun. publiſhed, among other tracts, *A diſcourſe ſhewing the impoſſibility of proving a future ſtate by the light of nature*. A ſenſible performance, and ſufficient to afford ſatisfaction to any one who does not give his prejudices the dominion over his common ſenſe.

But ſome prejudices are irradicable, and then moſt of all when there is any fear that our convictions againſt them, may put us upon ill terms with our fellow members of the ſame communion. And ſuch, I am ſorry to obſerve, ſeems to have been the caſe with this ingenious writer, ſo far as to have led him into what appears to me to be a plain contradiction. For having brought ſome circumſtances to prove, that the power of thought depends upon the body, he adds, " What I have here ſaid does not prove, " that the ſoul cannot think out of the body, " for I am ſure, from revelation that it can *(a)*". And again, " The will of God is made known " to us two ways, by nature and by revelation; " by this latter way, God hath undoubtedly " made known his will to be, that our ſouls

(a) Diſcourſes. Vol. I. p. 214.

" ſhall continue to think when the body is " dead *(b)*."

And yet he expreſsly aſſerts the doctrine of revelation to be, *No reſurrection, no future ſtate*, which, commenting upon 1 *Cor.* xv. 32. he thus makes out. " *If the dead riſe not, let us* " *eat and drink, for to morrow we die*, that is, " ſays Mr. *Hallet*, we ſhall periſh; there will " be an end of us; we ſhall neither be happy, " nor miſerable. It is evident, this muſt be the " meaning of the word *die* in this place, becauſe " elſe the reaſoning of the Apoſtle would not " appear to be good and juſt. If by the ex- " preſſion *we die*, he only meant *our bodies die*, " while our ſouls ſhall be happy in another " ſtate, the argument would have no force, it " would be a mere tautology." And then, proceeding to paraphraſe the Apoſtle's diſcourſe upon the ſuppoſition, that he means only that our bodies die, he concludes thus. " This paraphraſe " contradicts itſelf; and I know not how to pre- " vent a contradiction in the paraphraſe of this " verſe, provided we do not underſtand the A- " poſtle as arguing upon the ſuppoſition that if " there is no reſurrection, there will be no future " life even for the ſoul *(c)*."

But if we underſtand the Apoſtle to argue upon that ſuppoſition, we muſt, I trow, underſtand him to argue againſt the paſſage or paſſages of revelation, which, according to Mr.

(b) Ibid. p. 221.
(c) Diſc. p. 319, 320.

Hallet,

Hallet, " give us undoubted aſſurance that our " ſouls ſhall continue to think, after the body is " dead." For in that caſe, there muſt be a future life of the ſoul, which has no connection with the reſurrection of the dead, and which, according to revelation itſelf, makes the reſurrection unneceſſary.

I have ſuppoſed above, that this conceſſion might be nothing more in Mr. *Hallet*'s intention, than a *ſop* for the elders of his church, inaſmuch as he does not once attempt to point out what text or texts of ſcripture they were, which made him ſure, that the ſoul continues to think, after the body is dead. But Mr. *Grove*, having laid his finger upon this weak place, Mr. *Hallet* was under a neceſſity to explain himſelf farther upon it (as we ſhall ſee by and by) but ſtill without citing any *revealed* authorities.

I have given one inſtance of the anger of our *Britiſh Biographers* againſt this argument, ſo friendly to *Revelation*, in the caſe of Mr. *Locke*, and am now about to exhibit another of their malevolence to Mr. *Hallet* for the ſame offence.

" The ſame year, [1730] he [Mr. *Henry* " *Grove* of *Taunton*] publiſhed, *Some thoughts* " *concerning the proof of a future ſtate from rea-* " *ſon*, in anſwer to the Rev. Mr. *Hallet*, jun. " who, *in his great zeal for the Chriſtian Re-* " *velation*, and to make it appear *abſolutely ne-* " *ceſſary*, had endeavoured to weaken the argu- " ments from reaſon for a future ſtate *(d)*".

(d) Biog. Brit. Art. GROVE.

It is not eaſy to diſcern whether this ſpiteful ſneer is aimed more immediately at Mr. *Hallet*, or the *Chriſtian Revelation*. Let us turn the tables upon Mr. *Grove*, and ſay, "who in his "great zeal for the moral government of God, "hath endeavoured to weaken the arguments "for a future ſtate, taken from revelation, by "endeavouring to ſhew, that the Chriſtian Re-"velation was not *abſolutely neceſſary*." Is the zeal of Mr. *Grove* in one caſe, more laudable, than the zeal of Mr. *Hallet* in the other? To have any advantage againſt Mr. *Hallet*, Mr. *Grove* muſt prove that the *Chriſtian Revelation* was not abſolutely neceſſary: and that, ſuppoſing it to be abſolutely neceſſary, the moral government of God muſt want to be vindicated. We ſhall however ſee preſently, that, upon Mr. *Grove*'s own principles, if the Chriſtian Revelation is *in any degree* neceſſary, the moral government of God will ſtand juſt as much in need of *vindication*, as if the *Goſpel* of Chriſt was *abſolutely neceſſary*.

With reſpect to Mr. *Grove*'s arguments it is juſt ſufficient to obſerve, that he beats the old hoof of the *vis inertiæ*, and the diviſibility of matter, after Dr. *Clarke*; of man's being an accountable creature, preſent unequal diſtribution, &c. produces ſome of the old texts, intermixing here and there a ſarcaſm, which is nothing to the purpoſe. His great ſtrength ſeems to lie in fighting againſt *Locke*'s ſuppoſition of thought being ſuper-added to matter, from the mere logical terms of *thought*'s being an *abſo-*

lute,

lute, *primary* and *numerical* quality, *ſimple*, and therefore not compatible with a *compound* being, or one that has parts; which after all is mere ſcholaſtic jargon, of no weight either to prove or diſprove the fact.

Mr. *Hallet* replied to this anſwer, and, "Mr. "*Grove*, though very averſe to controverſy, yet "this being with him a favourite ſubject, and "as he apprehended of the laſt importance to "vindicate the moral government of God, de-"termined to review the debate," which he began to do in a tract intituled, *The weight of tradition concerning a future ſtate*; but lived to finiſh only one chapter of it.

How well Mr. *Grove* might be ſuppoſed to acquit himſelf on this favourite ſubject, and in the defence of the moral government of God, we may learn from an anecdote preſerved by the compilers of the *Biog. Brit.* who I dare ſay will lay under no ſuſpicions of miſrepreſenting their hero, with thoſe who read his article.

"Mr. *Grove*, ſay they, was much converſant "with *Cicero*'s philoſophical works,——and "thought his diſcourſes of the *Nature of the* "*Gods*, and the immortality, an UNANSWER-"ABLE DEMONSTRATION of the GREAT "NECESSITY and advantage of the Chriſ-"tian Revelation, againſt thoſe who would pre-"tend, that when Chriſt appeared to enlighten "and reform the world, he was not wanted, "and that unaſſiſted reaſon was ſufficient for "this end; For the great uncertainty in which "*Cicero*, one of the greateſt geniuſes of pagan-

"iſm,

"iſm, was involved, and repreſents all their "philoſophers as involved, with regard to one "of the moſt important doctrines, of the ex- "iſtence, perfection, and providence of God, "and their own future exiſtence and ſtate, is an "argument FROM FACT, which overturns "all the ſpecious theories of modern Deiſts, and "ſhews too their great ingratitude who, in- "lightened by the Goſpel, and thus inabled to "think more clearly and juſtly on theſe ſubjects, "refuſe to own their obligations, and employ as "an argument againſt Revelation, the light they "really receive from it *(e)*"

Now I would deſire to know how the moral government of God could be vindicated, in making *Cicero* an accountable creature, and at the ſame time leaving him under his great uncertainty concerning his being, providence, &c. and his own future condition, more than if *Cicero*, an accountable creature, had been left in abſolute ignorance of theſe particulars? It appears to me, upon Mr. *Grove*'s own ſhewing, that it was impoſſible for *Cicero* to get out of this uncertainty without the aid of the Chriſtian Revelation, or ſomething equivalent to it. Were the pagans after *Cicero*, in *leſs* uncertainty? By no means. The Chriſtian Revelation therefore was not only *greatly* but *abſolutely* neceſſary to diſpel the clouds and darkneſs of this uncertainty; and Mr. *Grove* is juſt ſo much

(e) Biog. Brit. GROVE. rem. B.

the

the more diſingenuous than the modern Deiſts, as he plays an hypotheſis in his diſpute with Mr. *Hallet*, againſt a fact which he certainly knew and acknowledged to be true.

Theſe inconſiſtencies are not uncommon; they are the neceſſary conſequences of attempting to preſcribe fitneſſes and rules of moral Government to God. Dr. *Clarke* fell into them, as hath been ſhewn by Mr. *Hallet* and others, and Mr. *Grove* who followed him, *ſed longo intervallo*, could hardly hope to eſcape them.

But I return to Mr. *Hallet*, who, having inferred from St. *Paul*'s argument, 1 *Cor.* xv. 32, that if there was no reſurrection there would be no future ſtate; and having ſaid likewiſe in the ſame treatiſe, that he was aſſured from revelation, *that the ſoul ſhould continue to think after the body was dead*, was called upon, as well he might be, by Mr. *Grove*, to explain himſelf; Mr. *Grove* ſuppoſing that the ſcriptures he himſelf had brought to prove the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, were utterly inconſiſtent with Mr. *Hallet*'s axiom, *No reſurrection, no future ſtate (f)*.

To this Mr. *Hallet* anſwers, "That the ſame "ſacrifice purchaſed, and the ſame God promi-"ſes *at once* all theſe three things together, the "ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, the reſurrection "of the body, and the future ſtate beyond that, "and conſequently if there had been no reſur-"rection purchaſed, there would have been no

(f) *Some* Thoughts, p. 119.

"future

" future ſtate. The connection between the " reſurrection and the future ſtate, in this laſt " view of things [i. e. as exhibited by revela- " tion] is not *natural*, but is derived from the " will and wiſe appointment of God, who has " determined (not to give men their full recom- " penſe in a ſeparate ſtate, but) *both* to awaken " men's ſouls, and to raiſe their bodies, and to " give them a recompenſe in a ſtate of union. " If God had not determined to raiſe men's bo- " dies from the dead, it does not ſeem likely " that he would have determined to awaken " men's ſouls immediately upon their dying, " or to have given them either happineſs or " miſery, after the deſtruction of this world. " The connexion here between a reſurrection " and a future ſtate, is founded on the will of " God, and on their being *both* revealed toge- " ther in the ſame promiſe *(g)*."

Now here it is remarkable that Mr. *Grove*, from a ſtring of texts which he produceth to prove the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, concludes, upon the authority of ſcripture, that the ſoul is of a diſtinct *nature* from the body, and conſequently would not *naturally* die with the body, or, which is the ſame thing, would *naturally* ſurvive the body, although there ſhould be no reſurrection. And then, as Mr. *Grove* held that no ſentence of death was paſſed upon the ſoul, it followed, that God did not interfere in this matter, but left the ſoul's future

(g) *Hallet*'s Defence, p. 63.

exiſt-

exiſtence upon the powers and capacities with which it was originally endowed.

But Mr. *Hallet*, we ſee, inſiſts that the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul was matter of purchaſe by the ſacrifice of Chriſt, as well as the reſurrection of the dead, and that *both* were purchaſed and promiſed at one and the ſame time, and conſequently there was no ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, before the promiſe took place, or in other words before the price was paid. It does not indeed appear whether Mr. *Hallet* was *aſſured* of the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul by the ſame texts of ſcripture which Mr. *Grove* produces, foraſmuch as the former produce *no* text to this purpoſe at all.

But as Mr. *Hallet* ſays that "theſe texts did "not concern him, who had declared his firm "belief that the ſoul is a diſtinct ſubſtance from "the body, upon the authority of the New "Teſtament," theſe muſt be the ſame texts upon which he grounded his ſaid belief.

Now ſince theſe texts ſpeak ſo *obſcurely* and *uncertainly* of the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, that two very learned and ingenious men cannot agree whether the ſeparate exiſtence they ſpeak of, is *natural* to the ſoul, or only *accidental* by way of purchaſe, favour, or promiſe, is it not preſumeable that, when theſe texts come to be rightly underſtood, they may be found not to ſpeak of any *ſeparate exiſtence at all?*

But Mr. *Hallet* in his explanation of his meaning, hath incumbered himſelf with a difficulty, which I ſee not how it is poſſible for

any one who eſpouſes his hypotheſis to ſolve. Mr. *Hallet* ſays that Chriſt purchaſed, and God promiſed, a ſeparate exiſtence of the *ſoul*, the reſurrection of the body, and a future ſtate beyond that, AT ONCE, all three together. If this be ſo, how does it appear that this promiſe ſhall not be performed *at once?* Where does it appear by any promiſe either in the Old or New Teſtament, that God is determined to *awaken* men's ſouls, *before* he raiſes their bodies? A promiſe relates to ſomething future; and therefore when this promiſe was made, it muſt be underſtood, that the ſouls of dead men were not awakened, nor, as a purchaſe by ſacrifice was to be made of *this* privilege, could they be, till the ſacrifice was offered. Now where is there a text to be found, which ſhews that in conſequence of this ſacrifice, men's ſouls which till then, had been aſleep, ſhould be immediately awakened, and that from thenceforward, all the ſouls of men ſhould paſs into a ſtate of ſeparate conſcious exiſtence, immediately upon their diſunion from the body? I do not here make uſe of Mr. *Hallet*'s expreſſion of *awakening men's ſouls immediately upon their dying*: as it is not ſenſe; for what occaſion to awaken that which, *ex hypotheſi*, never was aſleep?

XXI.

1729. I ſhall conclude this enumeration, with a ſhort notice of a pamphlet printed for *Noon*, 1729, the ſame year in which Mr. *Hallet*'s Diſ-

Diſcourſes appeared, intituled, *The materiality or mortality of the ſoul of man, and its ſameneſs with the body, aſſerted and proved from the holy ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, ſhewing, that upon the death of the body, all ſenſation and conſciouſneſs utterly ceaſe till the reſurrection of the dead.*

The author of this very ſolid and deciſive diſcourſe, inſtead of amuſing himſelf with the mataphyſical dreams of the immortaliſts, confines himſelf wholly to the ſcriptures, and his book may be conſidered as a proper ſupplement to Mr. *Hallet*'s Diſcourſe, which left the matter ſhort, by a conceſſion, which, as I hope, now appears, ought not to have been made. In one word, this writer not only eſtabliſhes his principle, on the firm and ſtable foundation of the word of God, but ſhews the futility of thoſe concluſions drawn from certain texts of ſcripture, which are ſuppoſed by Meſſrs. *Grove*, *Hallet* and others to ſpeak of the ſoul as a ſubſtance diſtinct from and wholly independent on the body and its organization.

Mr. *Grove*, having made ſuch uſe of the ſcriptures, as he thought conducive to the proof of his point, goes on to ſay, "The ſacred ſcriptures being thus clear and expreſs in this matter, if there are any *obſcure* paſſages which ſeem to ſpeak a contrary language, they ought to have their meaning fixed by ſuch more plain and obvious ones as thoſe which have been now quoted *(h)*."

(*h*) *Some* Thoughts, &c. p. 118.

But what muſt we do with thoſe *clear* and *plain* paſſages, which not only *ſeem*, but certainly do ſpeak a contrary language? not to the texts themſelves cited by Mr. *Grove*, but to *his* interpretation of them? That ſuch paſſages there are, we are informed by the writer of the pamphlet juſt mentioned, and by others whoſe interpretations we have ſomewhat more reaſon to rely upon, than the interpretation of thoſe who are for *ſquaring* the word of God by the twinkling light of a ſort of natural religion, from which they themſelves are obliged occaſionally to turn. On another hand,

The learned Dr. *Law* having, in his *Appendix* to his *Conſiderations*, examined the whole number of thoſe texts which Mr. *Grove* calls clear and expreſs for the natural immortality of the ſoul, and offered ſome rational explanations of them, concludes thus.

" This may ſerve for a ſpecimen of ſuch " texts as are uſually alledged on the other " ſide of the queſtion, [i. e. in favour of a " ſeparate exiſtence] all which, I believe, ap- " pear, even from theſe ſhort remarks upon " them, to be either quite foreign to the point, " or purely figurative; or laſtly, capable of a " clear and eaſy ſolution on the principles " abovementioned: *Nor can ſuch ever fairly be* " *oppoſed to the conſtant, obvious tenor of the* " *ſacred writings, and that number of plain ex-* " *preſs paſſages already cited (i).*"

(i) Dr. *Law*'s Conſiderations. Appendix. p. 414, ed. 1759.

Let

Let the reader judge from their reſpective writings which of theſe learned men, has more right to this argument.

I am greatly afraid the foregoing detail will appear to be tedious: and yet there is little more taken into it, than ſeemed to me to be abſolutely neceſſary to ſhew the riſe and progreſs of thoſe prejudices and that confuſion, which, to this hour, perplex the queſtion, concerning an intermediate ſtate. The account might have been ſwelled to ten times its preſent bulk. What is here exhibited ſeems to be ſufficient to authorize the following concluſions:

Firſt, That the notion of the ſouls immortality as a truth independent on the Chriſtian Revelation, was bred and nouriſhed among the ſchoolmen of the twelfth, thirteenth and a great part of the two following centuries, when ſenſeleſs quibbles paſt for the productions of genius, and unmeaning jargon for profound erudition. It will probably be ſaid, that the ſame concluſions have, ſince the revival of Letters, and the cultivation of ſound philoſophy, been drawn from rational premiſſes. Concerning this every man may judge as he ſees cauſe. I am unhappy enough to find no more demonſtration in the reaſonings of *Clarke* and *Baxter* for the natural immortality of the ſoul, than in the ſyllogiſms of *Lombard* and *Aquinas*.

Secondly, That theſe ſcholaſtic ſubtilties were adopted by the popiſh divines, as the groundwork of the fable of Purgatory, and the idolatrous invocation of Saints. Hence the ſcholaſtic immor-

immortality was incorporated, or rather confounded with the immortality brought to light by the Goſpel; and both repreſented as affording mutual light and ſupport to each other, and equally ſanctified by the canons and decrees of the church, in order to deter thoſe who were diſpoſed and qualified to philoſophize upon better principles, from purſuing their diſquiſitions to a fatal detection of theſe and other abſurdities, which could not have kept their ground otherwiſe than by retreating under the artillery of the *Vatican*.

Thirdly, That though the Proteſtants, on all other ſubjects, rejected all doctrines which were not built on a ſcripture foundation, they unhappily contented themſelves on *this*, with the teſtimony of popiſh and pagan *tradition*, and being either unable or unwilling to inveſtigate the real meaning of certain terms uſed in the ſcriptures, weakly concluded from the mere ſound of them, that the doctrine of the ſcriptures, and of the reigning philoſophy concerning the immortality or ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, was one and the ſame. Hence,

Fourthly, In all their diſputes with the Papiſts concerning the ſuperſtitions grounded on Purgatory and ſaintworſhip, they directed their arguments to the wrong object; and inſtead of inſiſting that the immortality ſubſequent to the general reſurrection, was the only conſcious future ſtate allotted in ſcripture, either for ſaints or ſinners, they embarraſſed themſelves with an hypotheſis of departed ſouls taken either immediately

into

into heaven, or immediately thruſt into a place of final torment, which it was not only impoſſible for them to verifie, but expoſed them to the reproach of deſerting the moſt orthodox of the Chriſtian fathers, who had provided hidden receptacles and intermediate *Limbuſes*, for different claſſes of human ſouls, according to their deſervings, till all ſhould be finally ſet right at a general judgment.

The Papiſts failed not to make their advantage of this weakneſs in their adverſaries. They argued thus. "A middle ſtate is what moſt Pro-"teſtants own; it is therefore more reaſonable to "believe what the church teaches about it, than "*to think at random* in this reſpect." Thus Cardinal *Alan* expreſſed himſelf in a diſpute with biſhop *Jewel* concerning purgatory and prayers forthe dead *(k)*. He was in the right. For the ſcriptures containing no account of this *middle ſtate*, a man might as well take the church's *random* account of it, as be at the pains to frame one of his own.

"*Moſt* Proteſtants, ſays the cardinal, own a "middle ſtate." Whence it may be inferred that *all* Proteſtants did not: and a great misfortune it was to the cauſe of the reformation, that they who did not own it, were not heard with patience and candour. Unhappily the Proteſtants had made up their ſyſtem, and fixed the boundary of orthodoxy, beyond which it was not permitted to paſs: and in this matter, they

(*k*) Biog. Brit. ALAN (William) rem. [C].

acted

acted juſt after the precedent the Papiſts themſelves had ſet them. *Calviniſts* particularly treated all who queſtioned the natural immortality of the ſoul, as impious, heretical, and no better at the bottom than atheiſts, even to the end of the laſt century.

For example. " He who denies the immorta-
" lity of the ſoul, denies *effectually* the *Being* and
" *Providence* of God, and the *full expectation* of
" recompenſes to be diſtributed after this life, ac-
" cording to the actions which dying perſons
" have practiſed through the race of their mor-
" tality."

This determination is to be found in the preface to a book written by *Timothy Manlove*, and publiſhed in the year 1696, intituled, *The immortality of the Soul, aſſerted.* The Preface was written, at leaſt ſubſcribed by *John Howe* and *Matthew Sylveſter* names of renown in their day, among the Diſſenters, among whom likewiſe Mr. *Manlove* was a miniſter.

In anſwer to this, Mr. *Layton* above-mentioned, in his Obſervations on *Manlove*'s treatiſe, reminds them, that " The certainty of a reſur-
" rection, and laſt judgment, reſts not upon the
" belief of the ſoul's immortality, but upon the
" ſtrong current and agreement of the Goſpel,
" and ſeems to be as true, evident, and well
" proved, as the truth of that text is that *Jeſus*
" *Chriſt came to ſave ſinners*; although ſays Mr.
" *L*, Mr. *Manlove*, his elders and churches, and
" many others, take too little notice of them,
" and make mention of them accordingly." Meaning,

ing, that they undervalued the evidence of the ſcripture for a future ſtate, in compariſon of that drawn from the natural immortality of the ſoul.

And if this was not truly the caſe, what could Meſſieurs *Howe* and *Sylveſter* mean by *the full expectation of recompenſes*, as if ſuch expectation grounded on ſcripture evidence was not *ſufficiently* full, without the aid of a philoſophical demonſtration? And then, if the ſcripture is not ſufficient in one caſe, why not inſufficient in another? And if this inſufficiency is to be ſupplied by traditions, why are not eccleſiaſtical traditions as availing as philoſophical ones? Why ſhould the immortality of the ſoul be believed rather than a Purgatory? or laſtly, Why ſhould the Papiſts be thought to argue more abſurdly, and childiſhly when they infer a man's atheiſm from his diſbelief of their *other* doctrines, than ſuch Proteſtants as theſe, who draw the ſame conſequence from the diſbelief or denial of the naturality of the ſoul?

In the ſame ſtrain of *illiberal*, *inquiſitorial* abuſe (for it is no better) have theſe immortaliſts treated their opponents even to this very hour. Dr. *Goddard*, calls them *Socinians*. But all ſides ſeem to be agreed that he knows little or nothing of the matter. A Doctor of more importance, hath more lately ſtyled the ſleep of the ſoul, A SEMIPAGAN DREAM. What may be meant by this phraſe he beſt knows who invented it. But the doctrine ſo ſtigmatized is ſuppoſed by ſome very competent judges, to be *ſuch a dream*, that if it is not added to ſome *other dreams* in a

book called the *Divine Legation* of *Moſes*, &c. the main principle of that elaborate work, muſt effectually ſink under a moſt manifeſt and mortifying incapacity of *Demonſtration*.

The ſame author hath ſaid, on the ſame occaſion, that "They who hold the ſoul to be only "a *quality*, and yet talk of its ſleep between death "and the reſurrection, uſe a jargon, which con-"founds all languages, as well as reaſon. For "ſuch a ſleep is an annihilation, and the waking "again, a new creation."

As for the jargon, we freely reſign it to whom it may belong. Whether the ſoul is a *quality* or a *ſubſtance*, if its conſcious perception is ſuſpended between death and the reſurrection, you may call that *annihilation*, or whatever elſe you pleaſe, provided you will allow that God can create it anew. We are certain the Creator has the ſame power over the ſoul as over the body. The body returns to the duſt from whence it was originally taken; and if the ſame body is to be reſtored to its vital functions, or if another body is to be ſubſtituted out of the ſame materials, it is either way, as ſtrictly and properly a new creation, as that of *Adam* was. But, according to our critic's principles to ſay ſuch a body *ſleeps*, is *uſing a jargon which confounds all languages, as well as reaſon*. The comfort however is, that, even our adverſaries being judges, it is the *jargon* of the *New Teſtament*.

For ought then that appears to the contrary, the doctrine of the ſleep of the ſoul, may be a doctrine of the *Socinians*, and yet no hereſy. It

may

may be in the eſtimation of ſome people, a *Semipagan dream*, and ſtill perfectly conformable to the ſcriptures, and their account of the power of God. It may ring, in ſome delicate ears, like *jargon*, and ſtill have all the properties of good ſenſe and ſound reaſon.

But *Socinian*, *Semipagan*, *Idiot*, &c. are excellent words to throw an *odium* upon the perſons and opinions of obnoxious adverſaries, eſpecially under the management of thoſe who *have the art of giving wit and dignity to their Billingſgate (l)*, and effectually terrify many feeble minds from examining into the real importance of any doctrines dreſſed out in theſe *Sanbenitos*.

On the other hand, it hath happened, that the *ſoul-ſleepers* by aſcribing the future immortality of man, ſolely to the gratuitous gift of God in Chriſt, have incurred the indignation of the penetrating and liberal ſoul of the accurate Mr. *Caleb Fleming*, who hath accordingly given warning to the world that the *ſoul-ſleepers* and *materialiſts*, down from Dr. *Coward*, to Dr. *Law* and Mr. *Peckard*, are and have been ſo far from *Socinianiſm*, *Paganiſm*, or other heretical blemiſh, that they "are evidently fond of myſtery, frequently "converſant in the ſecret chambers of churchiſm, "and great ſticklers for orthodox ſyſtems and "confeſſions."

Generally ſpeaking, it is no bad ſign of the moderation and ſincerity at leaſt, if not of the good ſenſe and juſt reaſoning of thoſe writers to

(*l*) See *Pope*'s works, vol. iv. ed. 1753. p. 82.

whom the obloquy of their adverſaries in two different extremes, imputes views and principles, utterly inconſiſtent with each other. But our misfortune in the preſent caſe, is, that where the judgment is ſo totally depraved on the one hand by outrageous pride and paſſion, and ſo miſerably enfeebled on the other by ignorance, prejudice and incapacity, praiſe and calumny will always convey the ſame idea, to the diſcerning byſtander, namely, that of ſound without ſenſe.

Thus, for a long time, the deciſions of pagan philoſophers, and the affirmance of the natural immortality of the ſoul in the creeds and confeſſions of particular churches, went amicably hand in hand, and ſhared between them the glory of the univerſal aſſent and conſent given to their reſpective demonſtrations: till unhappily for themſelves, the churchmen and philoſophers fell out, and then, *great was the force of truth, and it prevailed.* The philoſophers would needs ſet up for themſelves, and diſclaimed all obligations to the church; and when the other ſaw that no better would be, *they* too tried to ſtand upon their own legs, and affected at leaſt to acknowledge, that the controverſy with the ſoul-ſleepers could only be decided by the ſcriptures, and upon that principle pretended to joyn iſſue.

" I have not, ſays one of them, called this " [*the ſleep of the ſoul*] an old exploded hypothe- " ſis with a deſign to intimate that any conſide- " rations of that ſort, would be ſufficient to over- " throw it. Its truth or falſehood, as a ſcrip-

" ture-

" ture-doctrine, muſt be determined by the au-
" thority of ſcripture *(m)*."

" The point in queſtion, ſays another, is to be 1758.
" decided by the ſacred writings alone *(n)*."

A third acknowledges, that, " the eternity of 1759.
" the ſoul of man, *a parte poſt*, has ſcarce the
" ſhadow of reaſon to ſupport it, and is obliged
" to fly to revelation, to ſilence inquiry *(o)*."

Little did they conſider to what diſtreſs this conceſſion expoſed them. They were not aware that the renowned *Tillotſon*, a moſt able and zealous patron of their cauſe, had owned that, " The
" immortality of the ſoul was rather ſuppoſed,
" or taken for granted, than expreſsly revealed
" in the Bible *(p)*."

The good archbiſhop indeed adds, that " The
" immortality of the ſoul may be inferred from
" ſeveral places of ſcripture, and the tenor of
" the whole Bible." But if the propoſition is is not *expreſsly revealed*, the right of *inferring* is equal on all ſides; and ſurely thoſe concluſions which are inferred from what is expreſsly revealed, ſhould be at leaſt as juſt and as ſtrong, as thoſe which are inferred from what is not.

" And therefore, in order to form a better
" judgment of this matter, we muſt examine the
" ſcripture language more particularly, and ſee
" what all thoſe ſeveral terms and phraſes
" may imply in the original, which are ſup-

(*m*) Examin. of the Bp. of *London*'s Diſc. p. 279.
(*n*) *Steffes five* Letters, p. 7.
(*o*) *Critical Review*, *Auguſt*, 1759, p. 99.
(*p*) Sermons, vol. xi. 8vo. ed. 1744. p. 4892.

" poſed

"poſed to include the doctrine above-men-
"tioned."

Theſe are the words of the worthy maſter of *Peterhouſe*, and expreſs the deſign of his *Appendix*, a work, which, by the clamour that has been raiſed againſt it, a byſtander would ſuſpect muſt have been planned with an expreſs and avowed purpoſe of ſubverting the Chriſtian religion. Nor indeed is this the worſt. A very learned and candid advocate for the doctrine of the ſaid Appendix, having upon account of his publiſhing his ſentiments relative thereto, undergone ſome ſuch *hardſhips*, as have not been heard of, for many years in this *proteſtant* country *(q)*.

But to return to the conceſſions above-mentioned. Both ſides being thus agreed to appeal to the ſcriptures, one might have hoped the diſpute would have been brought to a ſpeedy and deciſive iſſue. But it quickly appeared, that the appeal of the *immortaliſts* to the ſcriptures, was but affected. They began to perceive the ſcriptures were not to be truſted with the deciſion of ſo *important* and *popular* a point, without certain *accommodations* borrowed from their old Friends the philoſophers. And remarkable it is, that the very man, who, as mentioned above, had put the cauſe upon the determination of the ſcriptures *alone*, without any ſavings to tradition, finding there was no managing Dr. *Law*'s Ap-

(q) The caſe of this worthy perſon, will *in due time* be laid before the public, with all its circumſtances.

pendix,

pendix, or an acute and ingenious tract in the *Monthly Review (r)*, which had taken him to task, this very man, I ſay, did not ſcruple to call to his aid *Pythagoras*, *Homer*, *Theognis*, *Cicero*, and *Horace*; though, to ſave appearances, it was under the pretence of making them interpreters to MOSES, SOLOMON, JOB, PAUL, and JOHN. What the ſucceſs was of this expedient, may poſſibly appear upon ſome other occaſion.

With the ſame conſciouſneſs that the ſcriptures were not to be relied upon for the proof of the natural immortality of the ſoul, have Meſſieurs *Morton* and *Fleming* introduced the modern philoſophers, *Clarke*, *Peters*, *Baxter*, &c. having the modeſty, I ſuppoſe, to expect we ſhould pay that reſpect to theſe moderns, which we had refuſed to their ancient maſters, *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*.

It had been happy for theſe Gentlemen, ſuppoſing them qualified for the taſk, had they begun their lucubrations on this ſubject, with a previous examination, how far their ancient pagan doctors were to be depended on. That is to ſay, whether they do not contradict each other, and ſometimes themſelves? Whether the moſt dogmatical among them come up to the point to be proved, namely, the perſonal conſciouſneſs of the ſoul in a ſtate of *total* diſunion from the body? The future exiſtence of the ſoul, incruſted in corporeal particles, as ſome

(r) For *May* 1757. p. 402.

of

of them held, or, as others, in a ſtate of reſuſion into the τὸ ἓν, will not anſwer their end in citing them, in order I ſuppoſe, to prove the unremitting conſciouſneſs of the ſoul in a ſtate of ſeparation from *all* body, a thing, in my humble opinion, which theſe ancient ſages, never once thought of.

For the reſt, it is well known that, upon the ſuppoſed demonſtration, that thought and conſcious perception are natural, inherent, and permanent powers in the human ſoul in every ſtate, the *Deiſts* build their ſeveral ſchemes of *natural religion*; and hence contend, there can be no occaſion for any poſitive or particular revelation of a future ſtate: conſequently that no ſuch revelation was ever vouchſafed. In this controverſy, it is amazing to ſee with what alacrity Chriſtian writers, not only grant theſe premiſſes, but aſſert them with great vehemence, as neceſſary for the honour and ſupport of revelation. But when the queſtion comes to be, what is the uſe and importance of a particular revelation? they begin to perceive their miſtake, and the advantage their adverſaries make of theſe conceſſions. Immediately the proofs of a future ſtate from *reaſon* and *nature*, which before had been as clear and demonſtrative as the noon-day ſun, became obſcure, inſufficient, and erroneous, and totally incapable of leading men to the truth without the aid of revelation. Thus have ſome of the moſt eminent defenders of the Chriſtian cauſe againſt Deiſm, drawn themſelves into ſuch manifeſt contradictions, as, had not their reputation

reputation been ſupported by merit of another ſort, muſt have derived upon them ſome degree of deriſion and contempt.

'Tis with great regret that I am obliged to mention, on this occaſion, the great names of *Tillotſon*, *Stillingfleet*, *Sherlock*, *Clarke*, *Hoadley*, &c. Theſe have been followed by great numbers of the lower claſſes of writers, who ſeem to have taken it for granted they could not go wrong, while they took men for their guides, whoſe victories, gained over their adverſaries in other provinces, had been ſo indiſputable.

I do not add the late philoſopher *Baxter* to the liſt, notwithſtanding his pretences to obviate *ſceptical objections*, and the praiſes beſtowed upon him by a certain writer of undoubted orthodoxy. *Baxter*'s ſentiments, it ſeems, concerning revelation, became, towards the end of his life, extremely problematical. And indeed no wonder. In *his* ſyſtem the ſoul is ſo exquiſitely equipped with conſciouſneſs, activity, and perception, in and of it's ſelf, and put into ſo complete a capacity for happineſs and miſery in a ſeparate ſtate, as not to admit the leaſt occaſion for a reſurrection of the dead, which accordingly is ſaid not to have been an article in Mr. *Baxter*'s creed.

Theſe metaphyſical ſubtilties we are however contented to let go for what men pleaſe to rate them at, provided they will allow, that God is able to ſuſpend the natural powers and faculties

of the ſoul, when, and for how long it may ſeem good unto him.

The queſtion then will be, whether it does or does not appear from the nature, progreſs, and end of his diſpenſations revealed in the ſcriptures, as well as from particular facts and declarations, that ſuch a ſuſpenſion actually takes place during the interval between death and the reſurrection? And the affirmative of this queſtion being eſtabliſhed by the *word of God*, the patrons of the natural immortality may figure as much as they pleaſe with their demonſtrations. We ſhall not diſturb them in their amuſements; though, we ſhall certainly think them no better employed than the *irrefragable* and *angelic* doctors of ſcholaſtic memory.

The queſtion we have with unbelievers is concerning a matter of fact, and the evidence upon which it is ſupported, and not concerning the reſult of a precarious hypotheſis; concerning the ſenſe of ſcripture, and the power of God; and not concerning the ſenſe of *Plato*, *Cicero*, *Deſcartes* or *Dr. Clarke*, or the natural powers and capabilities of matter and ſpirit. If it appears to be the will of God that there ſhould be a total intermiſſion of conſciouſneſs in man for a certain interval, our foundation ſtandeth ſure, *we know whom we have truſted, and we are perſuaded he is able to keep that which we have committed to him againſt the appointed day*. While all thoſe fine ſpun notions of the immateriality of the ſoul, and all the artificial deductions from that principle, teach nothing but the art of blowing

blowing ſcholaſtic bubbles, which, when they have had their run of faſhion, will as certainly go peaceably to their reſt, as the old *ſubſtantial forms* have done, without the leaſt detriment either to ſound learning or true religion. And that this may not paſs for a viſionary expectation without any tokens of its accompliſhment, I ſhall here ſubjoyn a remarkable paragraph which appeared in all our News-papers about two years ago.

" *Copenhagen*, Jan. 9, 1762. A perſon of " high diſtinction, who does not chuſe to be " named, but who is thoroughly perſuaded of " the value, and of the immortality of the ſoul, " invites the learned to compoſe a ſhort diſſer- " tation to prove by reaſon, and the authority " of the Holy Scriptures, that the ſoul, diſtinct " from the body, enjoys the faculties of think- " ing and acting. They have the choice of wri- " ting it, in Latin, French, German, or Da- " niſh; and he who treats the matter moſt clear- " ly and ſolidly, will receive a gold medal of " the value of ten Daniſh ducats. The pieces " are to be ſent franked, to the Office of Ad- " dreſs eſtabliſhed in this city, before the 2d of " February, 1763. It is preſumed, that though " the reward is but trifling, the importance of " the ſubject will produce a number of com- " petitors."

However this reſpectable perſon may be perſuaded of the *immortality* of the ſoul, it ſeems he is not quite ſatisfied, that it enjoys the faculties of *thinking* and *acting* diſtinct from the body,

even after all the *demonſtrations* of that point that have been offered to the world, by writers of the firſt reputation in ſuch reſearches. It is not to be doubted, but the reward, trifling as it is, hath produced a number of competitors. The honour of having a medal to ſhew, charged with legends and enſigns of victory, will be a ſufficient incentive to many an aſpiring mind, which would deſpiſe the remuneration of four pounds, twelve ſhillings and ſixpence Daniſh currency. In the mean time, the curioſity of the public will be intereſted to know what the competitors themſelves have produced, and in what reſpects the *clearneſs* and *ſolidity* of their lucubrations have given ſatisfaction to this Queriſt of high diſtinction, and ſupplied the defects of ſo many able writers who have gone before them in this intricate diſquiſition.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

Containing an Inquiry into the ſentiments of MARTIN LUTHER *concerning the ſtate of the Soul between Death and the Reſurrection.*

"LUTHER, ſays Cardinal *Du Perron* "held that the ſoul died with the body, "and that God would hereafter raiſe both the "one and the other *(s)*."

Mr. *Bayle* is in high wrath with the cardinal on this occaſion, and thinks it below his eminence's dignity and reputation to advance ſuch a calumny. But *Bayle*, ſuppoſing there might be ſomething in *Luther*'s works that gave a colour for *Du Perron*'s accuſation, applied himſelf to a divine of the confeſſion of *Augſburgh*, deſiring to know of him, "if there were "any pretext, that could occaſion *Du Perron*'s "ſpeaking as above *(t)*."

The anſwer of this Lutheran miniſter, as it is exhibited in *Bayle*'s Dictionary, will give me occaſion to examine into *Luther*'s real opinion on this ſubject.

(s) Peraoniana au Motte (LUTHER).
(t) Art. LUTHER. Rem. (D. D.)

He

He begins with ſaying, " *Luther* never taught " that the ſoul died with the body, and was to " riſe again with the body; it can never be " proved by his works, that he was of this opi- " nion."

Perhaps theſe propoſitions, as the cardinal has expreſſed them, are not to be found in *Luther*'s works, in ſo many words. We have ſeen however above, that *Luther* mentioned the *immortality of the ſoul*, as a *portentous opinion*, ſupported by nothing but the Pope's decrees *(u)*. And, indeed, if *Luther* did not hold an opinion equivalent to this aſcribed to him by *Du Perron*; I would deſire to be informed what may be the meaning of the following annotation upon *Eccleſ.* ix. 10.

" *Quia in inferno nullum eſt opus*, &c.] Alius " locus quod mortui nihil ſentiant. Senſit ergo " Salomon, mortuos omnino dormire, et nihil " prorſus ſentire. Jacent ibi mortui non nume- " rantes dies vel annos, ſed excitati videbuntur " ſibi vix momentum dormiviſſe.—Infernus au- " tem ſignificat foveam, ſepulchrum; proprie " vero, me judice, ſignificat illud abditum re- " ceſſum in quo dormiunt mortui extra hanc " vitam, unde anima abit in ſuum locum, " (qualiſcunque eſt, non enim corporalis eſſe " poteſt) ut intelligas infernum dici, ubi conti- " nentur animæ extra hunc corporalem mun- " dum, ſicut terra eſt ſepulchrum corporis *(w)*".

(u) P. 10, 11.
(w) Opera. Wittemb. Tom. IV. fol. 36. 1574.

Here

Here we find the ſoul as well as the body, in a *ſound*, *inſenſible ſleep*, and contained in an *incorporeal ſepulchre*, in like manner as the body is contained in the ground; the preſent and future condition of both denoted by the words *mortui* and *excitati*; and all this delivered by *Luther* as his own opinion.

Our divine proceeds. " And he *(Luther)* has " very clearly ſhewn, that he believed quite " contrary. Conſult what he has written upon " the 8th verſe of the 4th chapter of *Geneſis*, " where he ſpeaks of the death of *Abel*.

Here then follows the paſſage referred to, in *Luther's* own latin.

" *Gen.* iv. 9. *Et dicit Dominus ad* Cain, *ubi* " *eſt* Habel, *frater tuus?*] Hic clare oſtenditur " reſurrectio mortuorum, ſiquidem Deus ſe " mortui *Habel* Deum eſſe teſtatur, et mortuum " *Habel* requirit. Ex hoc enim loco conteximus " firmiſſimam rationem, quod ſi nullus eſſet qui " curam noſtri haberet poſt hanc vitam, *Habel* " occiſus non eſſet requiſitus. Sed Deus requi- " rit *Habel* ſublatum ex hac vita, non vult ejus " obliviſci retinet memoriam ejus, quærit ubi " ſit? Ergo Deus eſt mortuorum Deus; hoc eſt, " ergo etiam mortui vivunt, et habent Deum " curantem et ſalvantem eos in alia vita quam " hæc corporalis eſt, in qua ſancti affligun- " tur *(x)*".

The queſtion is what *Luther* thought of *the departed ſoul?* And we are ſent to conſult a

(x) Ibid. Tom. vi. fol. 64.

paſſage

paſſage where the ſoul is not once mentioned. The whole note is concerning the *dead perſon*, and reſpects the ſtate of the dead body, juſt as much as the ſtate of the departed ſoul; and the propoſition to be proved is *the reſurrection of the dead*. I do not undertake to ſupport *Luther*'s logic; but it is manifeſt upon what ſcripture his argument is grounded. The ſame indeed, which has been brought to prove the ſeparate exiſtence of the ſoul, though the ſoul is not once mentioned in our Saviour's argument with the Sadducees, to which *Luther* here refers. But what wonder, when men take theſe liberties with the ſcriptures to ſerve an hypotheſis, that they ſhould do the like by the writings of private doctors? For the reſt, had *Du Perron* undertaken to find the doctrine he aſcribes to *Luther*, in this paſſage juſt cited, it would have been an eaſier taſk, than to confute the doctrine itſelf when he had found it.

I return to *Luther*'s apologiſt. "The origin "of the calumny, *ſays he*, is in a letter he "[*Luther*] wrote to *Amſdorf* in the year 1522, "in which he appears much inclined to be- "lieve that the ſouls of the juſt ſleep to the day "of judgment, without knowing where they "are, *&c.* He does not pretend to ſay that "they are dead in this interval, but only lay in "a profound reſt and ſleep, in which opinion he "followed many fathers of the ancient church".

This Letter to *Amſdorf* I have never been able to meet with, or to hear of, after much inquiry; nor is it very material, as *Luther*'s ſentiments

timents are ſufficiently evident from this ſhort account of it. But the calumny, ſo far as it is one, did not take its riſe, ſolely at leaſt, from this letter. I have now by me a popiſh book in Engliſh, containing the lives of ſome of the Reformers, printed many years before *Du Perron*'s time, in which the diſbelief of the immortality of the ſoul is objected to *Luther*, and the authorities appealed to are *Luther*'s defence of his *articles* againſt Pope *Leo*'s Bull, cited above p. 10, and his comment upon *Eccleſ.* ix. 10. juſt mentioned, without any reference to, or mention of this letter to *Amſdorf*. If our apologiſt knew of theſe paſſages in *Luther*'s works, he impoſed upon Mr. *Bayle* in repreſenting this doctrine of his maſter, as only to be found in a private letter. But to take him in his own way.

1. That *Luther* did not pretend to ſay, the ſouls of the juſt are dead in this interval, is to little purpoſe, as *the profound reſt and ſleep, without knowing where they are*, anſwers the cardinal's purpoſe juſt as well: not to mention a ſuſpicious *et cætera* in the *Lutheran* divine's report, which may probably conceal more than he thought proper to expreſs.

2. The authority of the Fathers would have been much to the apologiſt's purpoſe, had he brought it in ſupport of *Luther*'s opinion againſt the cavils of the papiſts. But it is of no ſort of avail to defend an opinion of *Luther*, which, in the judgment of our apologiſt, ought to be

 recti-

rectified. As to the Fathers who were of this opinion, it is probable they ſaw this *profound reſt and ſleep*, as neceſſary for themſelves, and for the apoſtles before them, in oppoſing the *dæmon-worſhip* of the Pagans, as *Luther* found it afterwards to confound the ſaint-worſhip of Popery.

Well, "but *Luther*, ſays the apologiſt, rec-"tified this opinion in proceſs of time."

Did *Luther* then ſo far alter his mind as to recant, and eſpouſe the contrary doctrine? No, our apologiſt does not ſay *that*, though he would not be unwilling you ſhould ſo underſtand him. He only means that he qualified his opinions with certain *ſaving* limitations, the import of which, we ſhall have occaſion preſently to conſider. In the mean time, it is next to certain, that he held *the ſleep of the ſoul*, for ten long years without theſe *ſavings*, namely, from the year 1522, the date of his letter to *Amſdorf*, to the year 1532, when he publiſhed his commentary on *Eccleſiaſtes*. And his reflection on the death of *John* elector of *Saxony*, who died of an apoplexy immediately upon his returning from the chace, that ſame year, ſhews that he was then in no diſpoſition to retract it. *Deus*, ſays Luther, *illi evenire fecit, quod pueris, qui abſque cura naſcuntur, vivunt et exſpirant; cum reſurrecturus eſt* [Elector] *in die noviſſimo, putabit ſe ex ſaltu* Lochavienſi, *ubi venabatur, venire (y).*

(y) Seckendorf. Hiſt. Luth. lib. iii. p. 30.

The

The Apology is thus concluded. " And " though *Luther* ſeems in his later writings to " attribute *reſt* to the ſouls of the predeſtinate, " he does not mean thereby a reſt which is a " profound ſleep, and deprives them of the " viſion and converſation of God and the an- " gels. See his commentary on the 24th [it " ſhould be the 25th] chapter of *Geneſis*, where " he ſpeaks very largely of the ſtate of ſouls " departed."

So then *Luther* ſtill perſiſted that the ſouls of the predeſtinate were *at reſt*. But before we procede to examine theſe particular paſſages in the commentary on *Geneſis*, it will be neceſſary to premiſe the following conſiderations.

1. That *Luther* himſelf acknowledges he was ſometimes obliged to take methods of expounding ſcripture which he himſelf did not approve, *in gratiam auditorum (z)*.

2. That this commentary on *Geneſis*, was delivered at *Wittemberg* in way of public lectures, to a promiſcuous company of ſcholars and others, from the year 1536 to the year 1545. They were not intended for publication, till *Luther* underſtood that *Cruciger*, *Rorarius*, and others, had taken them down in writing. The account he himſelf gives of them is remarkable enough to be tranſcribed. *Extemporaliter et* populariter *omnia dicta ſunt, prout in buccam venerunt verba, crebro et mixtim etiam Germanica, verboſius certe quam vellem (a)*.

(z) Seckendorf. u. s. lib. ii. p. 24.
(a) Idem lib. iii. p. 669.

 3. That

3. That ſome diſputes had happened among his followers upon the queſtion, *what becomes of the ſoul after death?* which *Luther* aſſigns as the reaſon why he meddled with the queſtion at all *(b)*: which diſputes, by the way, he had endeavoured all along to ſilence, by ſaying, "that nothing is revealed to us on that head, "and that it is raſh to affirm any thing about "it without the word of God *(c)*."

4. It is certain that the general prejudice was againſt *Luther*'s opinion. The article of the *interceſſion* of ſaints which led directly to the practice of *invocation*, ſtuck long with many Proteſtants, even whole churches, and *Luther* himſelf was obliged to compromiſe matters with them as well as he could, even ſo late as the year 1539 *(d)*. And what wonder that in theſe circum-

(*b*) Ego quidem propterea eam diſputationem attingo, ut præcidam et amoveam curioſas aliorum quæſtiones et diſputationes. *In Geneſin.* xxv. 8.

(*c*) See his annotation on *Iſaiah* lxiv. 15, and compare it with what he ſays on *Matth.* xvi. 25.

(*d*) *Seckendorf.* Index tertius. Supplend. ad ann. 1522. And in the year 1539, it was among the inſtructions of thoſe who were appointed to viſit the *Marche* of *Brandenburg*, "that they ſhould injoin the Paſtors, to bring men *by* "*degrees*, from the ſaints unto God; that this would beſt "be done by teaching them that there was neither precept, "example, nor form in the ſcriptures for the invocation of "ſaints.---But that theſe things ſhould be inculcated with "caution and *modeſtly*, leſt the ſaints ſhould be contumeli-"ouſly treated, and deprived of their true honour." *Seckendorf*, l. iii. p. 238. *Maimbourg*, in his hiſtory of *Lutheraniſm*, ſays, that at the conference held at *Augſburgh*, 1530, on the deſign of reconciling the Proteſtants and the Papiſts, "the

circumſtances, and in a public lecture to which all ſorts of people had acceſs, *Luther* ſhould endeavour to put the determination of this queſtion upon ſuch a footing, that they among the Proteſtants who were diſpoſed to honour and revere the ſaints, ſhould neither be ſcandalized at his treating them as *non-exiſtents*, nor take occaſion from his conceſſions, to call for their interceſſion by prayer and adoration?

Let us now ſee how far this commentary on *Geneſis* may be ſuppoſed to have been adapted to theſe circumſtances. I ſhall give the citations in *Luther*'s own words, that they may not be ſuſpected to be miſrepreſented by an unfaithful tranſlation.

" GEN. xxv. 8. Abraham *collectus eſt ad* " *populos ſuos*] Hæc verba ſpiritus ſancti neuti- " quam otioſa ſunt nec dicuntur beſtiis, quæ " non eunt ad patres et populos ſuos; ſed ho-

" the former owned that ſaints and angels intercede for us, and " were therefore to be honoured but not invoked." *Seckendorf* does not contradict this, where it falls in his way, *Lib.* ii. p. 178. He only obſerves that both ſides agreed, that invocation was not commanded in ſcripture. Afterwards indeed, *viz.* lib. iii. p. 548, in anſwer to the biſhop of *Hilderſheim*, who inſiſted on the ſame fact: *Seckendorf*, ſays, " he does not " find any ſuch conceſſion was ever made, either at the " conference at *Augſburgh*, or elſewhere." The fact ſeems to have been, that *Melancthon*, a man of peace and meekneſs, had been too ſoft and tender upon this head of interceſſion, and might be underſtood to give it up. *Melancthon*'s timidity drew upon him the reproaches of *Luther* at certain times; on other occaſions, when it proceeded to dejection and deſpondency, *Luther* was as ready to comfort and encourage him.

" minibus

" minibus, et teſtantur reſtare poſt hanc vitam
" aliam et meliorem; quin etiam ante Chriſti
" adventum, fuiſſe populum viventium qui ha-
" bitant in terra viventium, et ad quos emigra-
" runt pii. Inde ergo patres intellexerunt re-
" ſurrectionem et vitam æternam.——De im-
" piis hoc non dicitur, ſed eſt ſermo de ſanctis
" et juſtis."

Thus far *Luther* attempts only to draw from theſe words a general proof of a reſurrection and eternal life; and this, he ſuppoſes, they ſuggeſted to the patriarchs. What he meant by a *living people, inhabiting the land of the living*, we ſhall ſee preſently. In the mean time, be it obſerved, that according to *Luther* the wicked and impious are not comprehended among the inhabitants of the land of the living. He proceeds next to the queſtion concerning the ſtate of ſouls after this life.

" Porro hoc loco quæſtio agitari poteſt de
" ſtatu animarum poſt hanc vitam.——Simplex
" autem reſponſio eſt quam Chriſtus præſcribit,
" cum inquit, Matth. xxii. *Deus non eſt mor-*
" *tuorum Deus, ſed viventium.* Inde certi
" ſumus vivere animas, et dormire in pace,
" nec torqueri ullis cruciatibus. Idque multi
" loci ſcripturæ ſanctæ comprobant, quod poſt
" mortem non morimur, ſed *vivimus* ſimpli-
" citer: ſicut ſententiæ admodum claræ *Eſaiæ*
" teſtantur. *Viri miſericordiæ colliguntur, et*
" *nemo attendit nec curat. Juſtus ſublatus eſt*
" *ante calamitatem, et antequam veniant ærumnæ,*
" *intrat in pacem ſuam, et requieſcit in cubiculo*
" *ſuo.*

" *ſuo.* Quieſcunt ſancti molliter et tranquille,
" ſicut in *Apocalypſi* teſtatur vox de cœlo; *A*
" *modo jam dicit ſpiritus, ut requieſcant a labori-*
" *bus ſuis.*"

This is our Reformer's idea of *the land of the living* mentioned above, the ſoul *lives ſimply, ſleeps in peace, without being tormented.* But it is remarkable that though theſe expreſſions may ſeem to include all ſouls whatever, and that all ſouls in this ſtate were ſo aſleep as to be void of all ſenſation, yet his proofs from *Iſaiah* and the *Apocalypſe,* only come home to the *ſaints,* and the *righteous.* Does he mean then that the ſouls of the ſaints and of the righteous *live ſimply,* ſleep in peace, inſenſible of joy, as well as of pain and torment? This he ſeems to have apprehended, might give offence, and therefore qualifies it as follows.

" Differunt tamen ſomnus ſive quies hujus
" vitæ, et futuræ. Homo enim in hac vita de-
" fatigatus diurno labore, ſub noctem intrat cu-
" biculum ſuum tanquam in pace, ut ibi dor-
" miat, et ea nocte fruitur quiete, neque quic-
" quam ſcit de ullo malo, ſive incendii, ſive
" cædis. Anima autem non ſic dormit, ſed vi-
" gilat, et patitur viſiones, loquelas angelorum
" et Dei. Ideo ſomnus in futura vita profundior
" eſt quam in hac vita, et tamen coram Deo
" vivit."

This, I ſuppoſe, is the *rectification* of *Luther*'s former opinion mentioned by the Lutheran divine. And to what does it amount? Even to this. " The ſoul is in a watchful, drowſy, ac-
" tive,

" tive, paſſive ſtate, acted upon by viſions and " converſations of God and angels, even while it " is in a more profound ſleep than that of a man " in this life who is conſcious of nothing." Does not this look liker a chambermaids riddle, than the ſober ſyſtem of a learned divine? And did ever any man of common ſenſe expreſs himſelf in ſo ſtrange a manner *who had a mind to be underſtood?* And what ſhall we make of what follows?

" Hac ſimilitudine quam habeo a ſomno viven- " tis hominis contentus ſum. In illo enim eſt " pax et quies. Putat ſe dormiviſſe vix unam " aut alteram horam, et tamen videt animam ita " dormire, ut etiam vigilet."

But in the paragraph immediately foregoing, his *Luther*'s ſleeping man was *conſcious of nothing*, and in this very circumſtance he places the difference between the ſleep of a living man, and the ſleep of a departed ſoul. Here he makes the ſleep of the living man, and the ſleep of a departed ſoul to correſpond throughout. For thus he concludes.

" Sic anima poſt mortem intrat ſuum cubicu- " lum, et pacem, et dormiens, non ſentit ſuum " ſomnum, et tamen ſervat Deus vigilantem a- " nimam. Ita Deus poteſt excitare *Heliam*, " *Moſen*, &c. et ſic regere ut vivant. Sed quo- " modo? Neſcimus. Sufficit ſimilitudo ſomni " corporalis, et quod Deus affirmat eſſe ſomnum " quietem et pacem."

Can any thing paint in more lively colours the diſtreſs of a man who, fearing to give offence,

is

is labouring to conceal his real ſentiments, under a cloud of words without any conſiſtency, or indeed any ſenſe in them?

Mr. *Bayle* however ſeems to have acquieſced in this account of his correſpondent, without giving himſelf the trouble to conſider whether even the ſort of ſleep, mentioned in theſe paſſages of *Luther*'s commentary, would not admit of all the conſequences that might be drawn from the mortality of the ſoul. The learned Dr. *Jortin* too, upon the credit, as it ſhould ſeem, of this ſame letter of the *Lutheran* divine to Mr. *Bayle*, has thought fit to ſay, "*Luther*'s "laſt and *ſettled* opinion ſeems to have been, "that the ſouls of the good are in a ſtate of fe-"licity *(e)*." A certain ſign that neither he, nor *Bayle*, had conſulted the paſſages to which the *Lutheran* divine refers. Since nothing can be farther from all idea of *ſettlement* than the obſcure and fluctuating notions we have juſt exhibited.

Dr. *Jortin* indeed aftewards refers us to two paſſages in *Luther*'s *Colloquia menſalia (f)* publiſhed by *Bell*, that may ſeem to favour his ſentiments concerning *Luther*'s *ſettled* opinion, which it will be neceſſary conſider.

"I am perſuaded, ſays *Luther*, of all thoſe "of whom the ſcripture ſaith, *And he ſlept with* "*his fathers*, that they are all in heaven, for this "word [*ſleep*] ſheweth ſomething that is good

(e) Life of *Eraſmus* vol. i. p. 122.
(f) Life of *Eraſmus* p. 336.

" in the ſcriptures *(g)*." Here the citation ends in the Dr.'s book; but in *Bell*'s, *Luther* goes on thus, " But of whom it is written, *They were* " *made away, and ſlain by the enemies, or were* " *devoured and torn in pieces by wild beaſts*, &c. " I am perſuaded that they are loſt and damned."

I imagine it will hardly be thought that all *Luther*'s ſentiments retailed in this *apocryphal* collection, are accurately reported. Be that as it may, it is plain that *Luther* here is inferring from certain expreſſions in ſcripture, the happy or miſerable condition of certain perſons *after this life*, whoſe end is deſcribed in thoſe expreſſions. It is likewiſe plain, from *Luther*'s ſaying that they who die by violence, *are loſt and damned*, that he is ſpeaking of the *final* (and not of the *intermediate* ſtate) both of the one and the other. To be *ſaved*, and to be *in heaven*, are, in popular language, the ſame thing, as to be happy; and are often uſed to expreſs the condition of good men departed when the ſeparate ſtate of their ſouls is never thought of. This particularly is *Luther*'s common language. Had the queſtion been put to him whether he thought *John* the Elector of *Saxony* abovementioned, was *in heaven?* He would moſt certainly have anſwered in the affirmative; and yet we have ſeen that he would have meant this, not of *preſent* but of *future* felicity. But what follows will put the matter out of all doubt.

The other paſſage is this, " Your ſon, ſays " *Luther* to a diſconſolate father, is well pro-

(g) Colloq. Menſ. p. 301.

" vided

" vided for; he liveth now with Chriſt. O! " would to God that I had finiſhed my courſe, " I would not wiſh me here again *(h)*."

The ſtreſs here, I ſuppoſe, is laid upon the *deceaſed ſon's, living with Chriſt*. It is pity the worthy Dr. did not caſt his eye towards the bottom of the page whence this citation is taken. He would there have found *Luther*'s own comment upon theſe and the like expreſſions. For having there repreſented a perplexed perſon in tribulation, objecting that the ſaying of St. *Paul*, Rom. v. 1. *They who are juſtified by faith, have peace with God*, &c. is not verified in thoſe good men who are not at peace in the preſent life, he anſwers, " True it is they have peace *in faith*, " but the ſame peace is *inviſible*, and ſurpaſſeth " all human conceit. Inſomuch, that being " even in death, *feeling no life at all*, we muſt " nevertheleſs *believe* we live." I will only add, that if theſe are the only teſtimonies which can be produced out of this folio book of above 500 pages for *Luther*'s *ſettled* opinion, they muſt be very thin ſown. But be they more or fewer, I will engage to confront them with an equal number on the other ſide out of this very collection.

I ſhall however now cloſe the preſent diſquiſition with an indiſputable proof that *Luther*'s lateſt, and on that account, *real* opinion concerning the ſtate of the dead, was conformable to his commentary on *Eccles.* ix. 10. his reflec-

(h) Coll. Menſ. p. 402.

tion on the death of *John* Elector of *Saxony*, and his letter to *Amſdorf:* and that upon better authority than that of the *colloquies*.

Sleidan, ſpeaking of *Luther*'s behaviour on the day of his death, tells us, " Inter cænandum, variis " de rebus locutus, hoc etiam inter alia rogabat, " num in illâ ſempiternâ vita, ſimus alter alterum " recognituri? cumque illi averent ex ipſo ſcire, " quid, inquit, accidit *Adamo?* nunquam ille " viderat *Evam*; ſed, cum illam formaret Deus, " altiſſima quiete ſopitus, dormiebat; experge- " factus autem cum illam videret, non rogat, " quæ ſit? aut unde veniat? ſed carnem eſſe de " ſuâ carne dicit, et os de ſuis oſſibus. Quî vero " ſciebat iſtud? Nimirum ſpiritu ſancto plenus, " et vera Dei cognitione præditus, ita pronunci- " abat. *Ad eundem modum*, nos etiam in alterâ " vita renovabimur per Chriſtum, et parentes, " uxores, liberos, et quicquid eſt, multo per- " fectius agnoſcemus quam tunc *Evam Adamus* " cognovit *(i)*."

Luther here conſiders thoſe who *will know* their friends in *that eternal life*, as in the ſame ſtate that *Adam* was when *Eve* was firſt preſented to him, namely, juſt awaked out of a deep ſleep. The *renewal* by Chriſt cannot poſſibly mean any thing but the reſurrection of the dead; and theſe two circumſtances, conſidered together, leave not the leaſt room for a conſcious intermediate ſtate. A plain proof that *Luther* never departed from the ſentiments he

(i) Sleidan. lib. xvi. 488.

diſcloſed

diſcloſed to *Amſdorf* in 1522, but retained to his dying moment, the ſame uniform idea of a total ſuſpenſion of thought and conſciouſneſs during the interval between death and the reſurrection.

The misfortune was that his more immediate diſciples were in another perſuaſion, and therefore, inſtead of defending their maſter's doctrine, ſet themſelves to prove he never held it (*k*); and thus leaving the main root of *Popery*, in the ground, it is no wonder they ſhould have been unſucceſsful in pruning away the corrupt fruits which always have, and always will ſpring from it.

(*k*) *Seckendorf*, I ſuſpect, wanted to conceal *Luther*'s ſentiments on the intermediate ſtate through a fooliſh apprehenſion of their being heretical. There are few traces of what *Luther* thought on the ſubject in all his voluminous work. And though he gives an account of moſt of his commentaries on the ſcriptures, under the ſeveral years in which they were publiſhed, he never mentions *Luther*'s opinion on the ſtate of the dead, except in one or two places, where *Luther* ſays, *there is nothing revealed about it in ſcripture*. *Luther*'s reflexion on the death of the elector of *Saxony*, was too ſtriking to be omitted, and had been recorded elſewhere. So likewiſe was his laſt converſation concerning the knowledge of our friends in another life. But *Seckendorf* took care to ſoften the *offenſive* expreſſions, as may be ſeen by comparing his account of it p. 636. with *Sleidan*'s and *Melchior Adam*'s. Theſe little partialities will ſtick to writers of the moſt conſummate integrity, of whom *Seckendorf* is in the foremoſt rank.

THE END.

See an account of a second Edition
of this Pamphlet, with Enlargements,
and account of writers upon the subject
carried on from 1765 to 1770 inclusive,
Monthly Review Vol: 48.
page 482

10 FE 58